GAEKWAD'S ORIENTAL SERIES

Published under the Authority of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwad of Baroda

GENERAL EDITOR:

B. BHATTACHARYYA, M.A., PH.D.,

RĀJYARATNA, JÑĀNAJYOTI

No. XCII

भट्टश्रीलक्ष्मीधरविरचिते

कृत्यकल्पतरौ

पञ्चमो भागः

॥ दानकाण्डम् ॥

KRTYAKALPATARU

OF

BHATTA LAKSMIDHARA

Vol. V. DANAKANDA

Edited by

K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR

Baroda

Oriental Institute

1941

Pages १–४१६ printed by Jaya Krishna Das Gupta, at Vidya Vilas Press, Benares City and Pp. i—xvi and 1—130 printed by C. Subbarayudu, at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras, and Published on behalf of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwad of Baroda by Benoytosh Bhattacharyya at the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Price Rs. 9

PREFACE

THE desire to present a systematic exposition of the teachings of Dharmaśāstra in elaborate treatises led to the composition of great digests. The earliest of them synchronised with the rise of the Rājput dynasties of mediæval India. Among such works, the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara has long held a pre-eminent position. But, manuscripts of it disappeared even in North India through the violence of the early Musulman conquests, and few copies of the whole *nibandha* were known. Peterson's discovery of an almost complete set in 1880 (he wrongly named it *Kṛtya-ratnākara*) in the Library of His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur remained unnoticed till attention was again drawn in 1915 to the work by an article of Rai Monmohan Chakravarti Bahadur in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.* Rajendralala Mitra and Aufrecht had noticed manuscripts of sections of it, but without any recognition of its value both intrinsically and as the oldest surviving *nibandha* on Dharma. Even writers on the Gāhaḍvāla rulers of Kānauj, under whom there was a final flare up of Hindu supremacy in North India before it passed under the Muslim yoke, failed to notice it as the most conspicuous proof of the revivalist enthusiasm and literary patronage of those kings. A recent history of Kānauj, for example, shows so little perception of the importance of the Digest and knowledge of its contents that it dismisses the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* with a few lines, naming as its chief kāṇḍas those on *Vyavahāra*, *Vivāda* (sic), *Dāna* and *Rāja-dharma.*

It is impossible to study the chief secondary works on Dharmas'āstra without becoming aware of the importance of Lakṣmīdhara's treatise and a longing to study it. The feeling had long been mine but the publication of the *nibandha* seemed impossible of realisation. Early in 1934, however, by a fortunate accident, I was honoured with an audience by His Highness the late Mahārāja of Baroda, Sir Sayaji Rao Gaekwad, well-characterised as "the Vikramāditya of our Age." The Prime Minister, Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, K. C. I. E. was present at the interview. A gracious invitation was extended to me to edit some works for the Gaekwad's Oriental Series. An explanation of the importance of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*, its size, rarity and fitness to figure in that great series aroused the interest of His Highness, who expressed a wish to have all facilities given me to edit the work properly. The chief difficulty had been that of obtaining the manuscript of the *nibandha* from the Udaipur Palace. The Prime Minister applied for the loan of the manuscript. The Udaipur authorities promised to see if it was still in existence. After further correspondence, and a personal recommendation to His Highness the Mahārāṇa by Col. Sir Donald Field, C.I.E. (now Prime Minister of Jodhpur) supporting the application for the loan of the manuscript, the promise of the early supply of a transcript of the entire *nibandha* was received. The transcript was despatched in July, 1935, and was received by me on the day on which I assumed charge of the Principalship of the Central Hindu College in the Benares Hindu University.

An examination of the manuscript revealed its very defective state. It became clear that the publication of parts of it, for which there was no second manuscript, would have to lie over on the chance of an assiduous search revealing the existence of further copies. I also found that it had been extensively laid under contribution by later writers like Hemādri, Caṇḍes'vara and

Mitra Mis'ra. It seemed possible to derive help in the elucidation of obscure passages in the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* from the digests composed by these later writers wherever their works covered the ground previously traversed by Lakṣmīdhara. A search for further manuscripts was begun at once. Press copies of the entire work were made and kept in readiness for collation with manuscripts that might be secured. To postpone the editing of the *nibandha* till all known manuscripts were secured for comparison would have hung up publication for years. Accordingly, I decided on proceeding with the editing of such kāṇḍas as could be dealt with on the basis of accessible manuscripts. In this way, five kāṇḍas were edited and sent to the press, *viz.*, *Dāna*, *Rājadharma*, *Tīrtha*, *Mokṣa* and *Gṛhastha.* For some of these, fresh manuscripts became available, either when the printing was proceeding, or after the printing of the text had been completed. In such cases, the variant readings of the new manuscripts were either incorporated in footnotes or reproduced in appendices. A manuscript for each of two missing sections of the Digest, unhappily incomplete, which are not represented in the Udaipur set, was discovered. They have to stand over till fresh exploration or a fortunate chance provides fresh manuscripts that would fill in the gaps in the manuscripts so secured.

The first of the sections to be completed, after the utilisation of every manuscript known to be in existence, is the *Dānakāṇḍa.* It is now released. The last of the manuscripts to be utilised for it was discovered in the Junior Bhonsle Rāj Library in 1939. Its readings were collected and printed as a final appendix. Before it could be completed by the addition of appropriate introductions on the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* in general, and on *Dānakāṇḍa* in particular, work that would not permit of any other pursuit intervened. It absorbed all my time. When release came a year ago, impaired health caused further

delay. It was thus possible to resume the work and complete it only recently.

As now presented, the first of the sections of the great Digest of Laksmīdhara to be published is really its *fifth* part. It is issued with the full complement of textual variants, footnotes indicating the "obligations" of later writers like Hemadri to Laṣmīdhara's work, appendices identifying the Vedic mantras cited in the text as well as the quotations from *smṛtis*, Epics and Puranas, and collecting the *pratijnah* or *visaya-nirdes'a* of later treatises on *Dāna*, like those of Ballāla Sena, Hemadri, Candes'vara, Madanasimha, Dalapati, and Mitra Mis'ra, and enumerating known works on *Dāna*. The purpose of the extracts on *pratajna* is to show the way in which Laksmīdhara's work was amplified, amended or developed by later writers. Of the later treatises on *Dana*, Ballāla Sena's *Dānasāgara* has been published partially but the greater part of it remains unprinted. The others, with the exception of Hemadri's *Dānakhanda*, are not yet printed. For the comparative study of *Dana* all of them are needed along with several other works available either in print or in script. The preparation of copies (and in one case of photographs) of these, which are so necessary for a comprehension of the evolution of *Dana* literature, has involved much labour, time and expense. The need to study them has also delayed the present publication. But it seemed well worth while to face the delay rather than follow the practice of publishing, without comparative studies involving such preliminary work, what are in effect nothing more than copies in print of manuscripts, with all their defects unremoved.

The Introduction prefixed to the *Danakanda* of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* falls into two parts. The first treats of the Digest and its author, and the second of the *Dānakānda* specifically and in relation to the evolution of the literature of Gifts. In the former, the information that can now be gathered about Laksmīdhara, his patron

king Govindacandra and the *Kṛya-Kalpataru* are summarised, and the time-relation of Lakṣmīdhara's work to the famous *Mitākṣarā* of his contemporary Vijñāneśvara and to the commentary of Aparārka is discussed on data not previously utilised. My conclusions are at variance with the views now holding the field, and advocated by writers of authority like Mr. P. V. Kane, but they are believed to rest on evidence which can not be lightly rejected or refuted. My aim in the Introduction has been to present part of a sketch, founded on a comparative study of the *nibandha* of which one section is now published (from among fourteen) of the Indian view of life as cherished by those who felt the urge to expound it in great digests, both as a personal duty and as an obligation of *Rājadharma* in its narrower and wider senses.

The general introduction on the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* and Lakṣmīdhara is largely a recast of two papers which appeared some months ago in the volume commemorating the Silver Jubilee of the *Madras Law Journal.*

The duty remains to state my obligations. They are naturally heaviest to His Highness the late Mahārāja Gaekwad of Baroda for graciously approving of the inclusion of the *nibandha* in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series and in commanding the provision of the necessary facilities, to His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur for sanctioning the preparation and supply of a careful transcript of all the twelve kāṇḍas in the Palace Library at Udaipur, and to Sir V. T. Krishnamacharya K.C.I.E., for the warm interest he has taken in the work from its inception, for the freedom given to the editor to select his own printers and choose a *format* that would be worthy of so important a work and of the series in which it would appear, and for securing for my use manuscripts or transcripts of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* that would not have been available to me without his intercession. Dr. B. Bhaṭṭācārya, the learned Director of the Oriental Institute and the General Editor of the Gaekwad's Oriental

Series, has met with promptness and sympathy all my requests for help in securing manuscripts. He also undertook the laborious task of comparing my press copy of the *Dānakāṇḍa* with the India Office manuscript of it, that he had secured on loan, as, under the rules, it could not go out of his personal custody. To Col. Sir Donald Field, I owe thanks for supporting by a personal letter to His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur the request for the supply of a transcript of the entire Digest. I owe the access to the Junior Bhonsle Rāj manuscript collection, which resulted in the discovery of manuscripts of some kāṇḍas of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*, to the Hon'ble Mr. B. S. Niyogi, Judge of the High Court of Nagpur. To the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and to the authorities of the University of the Punjab, I am indebted for the courteous loan of manuscripts in their libraries. To Mahāmahōpadhyāya Pandit Gopinath Kaviraj, M.A. and Dr. Mangaldeva S'āstri I am indebted for the loan of many manuscripts from the Sarasvati-bhavan at Benares. To the authorities of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, I am in debt for the loan of the manuscripts of the *Dānaratnākara*, the *Dānasāra* and the *Dānaratnapradīpa* from the Ānandās'rama at Poona. *Vaidyaratna* Captain G. Srinivasa Murti, B.A., B.L., M.B., C.M., the erudite Director of the Adyar Library, has placed me under unforgettable obligation by having manuscripts of several works on *Dāna*, like the *Dānaratnākara*, *Dānapradīpa*, *Dānaprakās'a* and *Dāna-Kamalākara* that were needed for comparative study, transcribed at the cost of the Adyar Library and placed at my disposal for editing the *Dāna-Kalpataru*. Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarthy, M.A., of the Bethune College, Calcutta, arranged to get me copies of passages from the *Dānasāgara* manuscript in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

In the actual editing of the *Dāna-Kalpataru* and in taking it through the press, I have been continuously

helped by my former pupil and colleague, Mr. A. N. Krishna Aiyangar, M.A., L.T., now of the Adyar Library, while in the work of collating my press copy with manuscripts in Maithilī, in interpreting difficult passages in the text and in comprehending *s'rauta-prayoga*, my debt is heavy to my friend and former colleague Mahāmahōpādhyāya Pandit A. Chinnaswami Sastri, Principal of the College of Theology in the Benares Hindu University, and his Assistant, *Mīmāṃsācārya* Paṭṭabhirāma S'āstri. In preparing the bibliography of Dāna literature I have received help from Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph. D., of the University of Madras and of course from Mr. Kane's exhaustive list.

Vasumatīvilāsa, Mylapore
19th November 1941

K. V. RANGASWAMI

CONTENTS

दानकाण्डविषयसूचिका

I

LAKṢMĪDHARA AND THE KṚTYA-KALPATARU

MODERN NEGLECT OF NIBANDHAS

IN modern treatises on Hindu Law sufficient justice is rarely done to the importance of the Digest (*nibandha*) in the evolution of Hindu social and legal institutions.[1] This is largely due to the circumstance that attention has been almost entirely monopolised by the great commentaries (*bhāṣyāḥ*) like those of Vis'varūpa, Vijñānes'vara, and Aparārka on Yājñavalkya, and Medhātithi, Govindarāja and others on Manu. The reputation of the *Mitākṣarā* of Vijñānes'vara has thrown into the shadow that of the digests, which were either anterior to or nearly contemporary with it. It is true that the digests of S'rīkara and Bhoja, to which the *Mitākṣarā* refers, have long been lost, but enquiry might well have been made for a work like the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*, which has been quoted with frequency and respect by digests from the middle of the twelfth century onwards. It is noteworthy that even a specialist like J. Jolly, who discussed the value of the digest literature nearly sixty years ago,[2] failed to do full justice to it. While he contended that "it may be confidently asserted that the supreme Rulers of Indian States in all parts of the Peninsula have always taken an active interest in the composition of Law-Digests and Commentaries, and this fact must needs raise a strong presumption in favour of the practical nature of these works," he conceded that it was "out of the question to compare them in any way to the law-codes of

[1] "They did their work so well that their Commentaries and Digests have, in effect, superseded the Smritis, at any rate in a very large measure." (*Mayne's Hindu Law*, 10th edition, 1938, p. 42.) Mr. P. V. Kane gives the commentaries and digests together one section *viz.*, 57, pp. 246-247. *History of Dharma-S'āstra*. Vol. I.

[2] *History of Hindu Law*, (Tagore Law Lectures, 1883), 1885.

modern Europe." He regarded the Digest as analogous to European treatises, which are cited in legal decisions, and as merely containing statements of law which their Hindu readers would know how far to apply or not in the actual conditions of the prevalent customary law. Jolly's references to the digest literature in his earlier work are only to comparatively late digests like those of Hemādri, Dalapati, and Ṭoḍarmal.

SCANTY KNOWLEDGE OF THE KALPATARU

Lakṣmīdhara's work was quite unknown to him. If he had had access to it, he would have seen its unique value and cited it as a prominent instance of a digest of law, whose binding authority, on the kingdom for which it was composed, must have been unquestioned, in view of the rank and position of its author and of the royal mandate which was responsible for its composition. Even in 1896, when he wrote his later treatise [1] he had no perception of the importance of this digest which he named. He was obviously unfamiliar, even in 1928, with the contents of those parts of it which he described in the English version of his *Hindu Law and Custom.*[2]

Virtually little was known of Lakṣmīdhara till 1916, when Rai Bahadur Monmohan Chakravarti included a short note on the *Kalpataru* at the end of an article on the contributions to Smṛti by writers of Bengal and Mithila.[3] He actually handled manuscripts of four sections of the *Kalpataru* in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. It was left to Mr. P. V. Kane to collect the available information on this digest and present it in the light of his own inspection of manuscripts of two sections, namely, *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* and *Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa.*[4] He had no access to the remaining parts though he was aware that Dr. P. Peterson had noted, as early as 1882, the existence of manuscripts of twelve out of its fourteen sections in the library of His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur.[5] Peterson's interests and knowledge did not extend to *Dharmaśāstra.* He had

[1] *Recht und Sitte*, Strasburg, 1896.
[2] ed. Bata Krishna Ghosh, Calcutta, 1928.
[3] *J.A.S.B.*, 1915, pp. 311—375.
[4] *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, 1930, pp. 315—318.
[5] *Report on the Search for MSS. in the Bombay Circle*, 1883, pp. 108, 111.

contented himself with quoting only the first quarters of the invocatory verses prefixed to each of the *kāṇḍas* and their colophons. His unfamiliarity with the *nibandha* literature made him cite the work, in spite of the explicit statement in the colophons, as *Kṛtya-ratnākara*, which is the distinctive title of a section of a similar digest composed by Caṇḍes'vara, in imitation of the *Kalpataru* [1] early in the fourteenth century.

INFLUENCE OF THE KALPATARU

The printing of some of the later *nibandhas*, which have laid the *Kalpataru* under liberal contribution, and the examination of manuscripts of unpublished digests, which have cited the *Kalpataru* freely, now make it possible to understand the reason for the great reputation which it formerly enjoyed, and the extent of its influence. Monmohan Chakravarti showed that the influence of the *Kalpataru* was traceable not only on the later writings of the Bengal and Mithila schools of Hindu Law but over all the chief legal writers in North India and the Dakhan. In Bengal, Aniruddha (c. 1160 A.D.) was the earliest to quote the *Kalpataru* as an authority, and Ballālasena, (c. 1165 A. D.) who was only a generation removed from Lakṣmīdhara, was influenced by him. S'ūlapāṇi (c. 1400 A. D.), S'rinātha (c. 1500 A. D.) and Raghunandana (c. 1490-1570 A. D.) in Bengal, S'rīdatta (c. 1245 A. D.), Caṇḍes'vara (c. 1300-1360 A. D.), Vācaspati Mis'ra (c. 1450 A. D.) and Rudradhara (c. 1360-1400 A. D.) in Mithila, Harinātha (c. 1350 A. D.), S'rīdhara (c. 1150 A.D.) Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa, Madanapāla (c. 1360-1390 A.D.) and the *Madanaratna* (c. 1425 A. D.) in North India, Hemādri (c. 1260 A. D.) and Pratāparudra (c. 1497-1539 A. D.) in the Dakhan are among those who used Lakṣmīdhara's digest in composing their own works. Along with references to Lakṣmīdhara and his digest in terms of deep veneration, we find in many later works, *e.g.*, those of Hemādri, Madanasimha and Caṇḍes'vara, the reproduction *wholesale* of pages after pages of the *Kalpataru*. Owing to this method of appropriation practised by the later digest writers, almost the whole of certain sections of the *Kalpataru* can now be detected in some later digests. This is the case with the

[1] Printed in 1926 in *Bibliotheca Indica*.

modern Europe." He regarded the Digest as analogous European treatises, which are cited in legal decisions, and merely containing statements of law which their Hindu reade would know how far to apply or not in the actual conditiops the prevalent customary law. Jolly's references to the dige literature in his earlier work are only to comparatively late diges like those of Hemādri, Dalapati, and Ṭoḍarmal.

Scanty Knowledge of the Kalpataru

Lakṣmīdhara's work was quite unknown to him. If he ha had access to it, he would have seen its unique value and cite it as a prominent instance of a digest of law, whose binding authority, on the kingdom for which it was composed, must have been unquestioned, in view of the rank and position of its author and of the royal mandate which was responsible for its composition. Even in 1896, when he wrote his later treatise[1] he had no perception of the importance of this digest which he named. He was obviously unfamiliar, even in 1928, with the contents of those parts of it which he described in the English version of his *Hindu Law and Custom.*[2]

Virtually little was known of Lakṣmīdhara till 1916, when Rai Bahadur Monmohan Chakravarti included a short note on the *Kalpataru* at the end of an article on the contributions to Smṛti by writers of Bengal and Mithila.[3] He actually handled manuscripts of four sections of the *Kalpataru* in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. It was left to Mr. P. V. Kane to collect the available information on this digest and present it in the light of his own inspection of manuscripts of two sections, namely, *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* and *Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa.*[4] He had no access to the remaining parts though he was aware that Dr. P. Peterson had noted, as early as 1882, the existence of manuscripts of twelve out of its fourteen sections in the library of His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur.[5] Peterson's interests and knowledge did not extend to *Dharmas'āstra*. He had

[1] *Recht und Sitte*, Strasburg, 1896.
[2] ed. Bata Krishna Ghosh, Calcutta, 1928.
[3] *J.A.S.B.*, 1915, pp. 311—375.
[4] *History of Dharmaṣāstra*, Vol. I, 1930, pp. 315—318.
[5] *Report on the Search for MSS. in the Bombay Circle*, 1883, pp. 108, 111.

contented himself with quoting only the first quarters of the invocatory verses prefixed to each of the *kāṇḍas* and their colophons. His unfamiliarity with the *nibandha* literature made him cite the work, in spite of the explicit statement in the colophons, as *Kṛtya-ratnākara*, which is the distinctive title of a section of a similar digest composed by Caṇḍes'vara, in imitation of the *Kalpataru* [1] early in the fourteenth century.

INFLUENCE OF THE KALPATARU

The printing of some of the later *nibandhas*, which have laid the *Kalpataru* under liberal contribution, and the examination of manuscripts of unpublished digests, which have cited the *Kalpataru* freely, now make it possible to understand the reason for the great reputation which it formerly enjoyed, and the extent of its influence. Monmohan Chakravarti showed that the influence of the *Kalpataru* was traceable not only on the later writings of the Bengal and Mithila schools of Hindu Law but over all the chief legal writers in North India and the Dakhan. In Bengal, Aniruddha (c. 1160 A.D.) was the earliest to quote the *Kalpataru* as an authority, and Ballālasena, (c. 1165 A. D.) who was only a generation removed from Lakṣmīdhara, was influenced by him. S'ūlapāṇi (c. 1400 A. D.), S'rinātha (c. 1500 A. D.) and Raghunandana (c. 1490-1570 A. D.) in Bengal, S'rīdatta (c. 1245 A. D.), Caṇḍes'vara (c. 1300-1360 A. D.), Vācaspati Mis'ra (c. 1450 A. D.) and Rudradhara (c. 1360-1400 A. D.) in Mithila, Harinātha (c. 1350 A. D.), S'rīdhara (c. 1150 A.D.) Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa, Madanapāla (c. 1360-1390 A.D.) and the *Madanaratna* (c. 1425 A. D.) in North India, Hemādri (c. 1260 A. D.) and Pratāparudra (c. 1497-1539 A. D.) in the Dakhan are among those who used Lakṣmīdhara's digest in composing their own works. Along with references to Lakṣmīdhara and his digest in terms of deep veneration, we find in many later works, *e.g.*, those of Hemādri, Madanasimha and Caṇḍes'vara, the reproduction *wholesale* of pages after pages of the *Kalpataru*. Owing to this method of appropriation practised by the later digest writers, almost the whole of certain sections of the *Kalpataru* can now be detected in some later digests. This is the case with the

[1] Printed in 1926 in *Bibliotheca Indica*.

Vīramitrodaya of Mitra Miśra,[1] the *one* work which, in its range and size, if not in its quality, excels the *Kalpataru*. The curious system of wholesale 'borrowing' was probably deliberate and designed with the purpose of making the later work supersede an earlier. It will partly account for the almost total disappearance of some of the great digests of the earlier epoch.[2] In the later digests the deferential manner in which views of Lakṣmīdhara are quoted suggests not merely the great value attached to his pronouncements but the merit of citations from a work which had become scarce. It may be noted, as an illustration, that the *Sarasvatī-vilāsa* of Pratāparudra-deva has a whole chapter (paras 627 to 773 in the edition of Foulkes) summarising the views of Lakṣmīdhara on the division of inheritance (*dāyabhāga*).[3] Not less noteworthy is Pratāparudra's reference to the author of the *Kalpataru* as *Bhagavān* Lakṣmīdhara, giving him the rank of an *ācārya* or *ṛṣi*.

The influence of Lakṣmīdhara did not penetrate to South India. He is not referred to by writers like Varadarāja, the author of *Vyavahāra-nirṇaya*,[4] Devaṇṇa Bhaṭṭa and Mādhavācārya, very probably because they had no access to the *Kalpataru*. The circumstance that Benares, in which Lakṣmīdhara probably lived and wrote, was repeatedly sacked by the Muhammadan invaders within a few years of Lakṣmīdhara's death, and the whole area was thoroughly ravaged,[5] will account for the almost total disappearance of manuscripts of *Kṛtya-kalpataru*, and the impossibility of the extension of its doctrines, in the following centuries, to an area so remote as South India.

[1] Composed between 1610 and 1640 A. D. under the patronage of Bir Singh of Orchha, the favourite of Jahangır. Twenty-two sections of it are known, and half the number has been printed at Benares, (1906-1939).

[2] "As better and more compact digests came to be composed in later times, the *Kalpataru* fell more and more into obscurity. It is for this reason that MSS. of the work are rare" (Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 318). It *cannot* be asserted with justice that later digests like the *Ratnākara*, *Madanaratna* and *Vīramitrodaya* are "better and more compact" than the *Kalpataru*.

[3] paras 627—773 in T. Foulkes, *Hindu Law of Inheritance according to the Sarasvatī-vilāsa*, 1881; and pp. 421—430 in the Mysore edition of *Sarasvatī-vilāsa*, 1927.

[4] This work is about to be published by me. Varadarāja probably lived before Mādhavācārya.

[5] In 1194 Benares was sacked on the defeat and death of Jayacandra, and over a thousand of its temples were destroyed. (Briggs, *Ferishtah*, I, p. 179; Elliot, *History of India*, II, p. 223.)

THE EVOLUTION OF THE NIBANDHA

Before proceeding to describe Lakṣmīdhara's work, a brief reference may be made to the place of the Digest (*nibandha*) in the evolution of Hindu Law. Our social institutions have, in a correct perspective, to be viewed neither as mere instruments nor as mere ends. While they serve initial and intermediate ends they cannot reach the ultimate end. They help our progress to the goal and furnish the means to the self-discipline without which reaching the goal *viz., Moksa,* will be impossible. In the almost endless chain of rebirth (*samsāra*), and in man's advance towards the end of re-birth, he is helped or retarded by his own actions (*karma*). The eternal (*sanātana*) institutions and ideals of life are designed to help the realisation of this end, The value of incarnating as a human being lies in the opportunity furnished by a *regulated* life in this world to break the chain of *samsāra.* Man attains the end not by flying from the world but by living in family and society. Responsibility for his destiny lies individually on every human being and collectively on society, represented by those who act as the guardians of the eternal social order (*varṇās'rama-dharma*). The social classes (*varṇāḥ*) are interdependent. So are human aims (*puruṣārthāḥ*). Institutions arise from the desire for well-being (*artha* and *kāma*) and they are sustained and directed by duty (*ḍharma*) towards emancipation (*mokṣa*). As a measure of discipline and training, and for the attainment of the goal, life is divided into stages marked by 'resting places' (*ās'ramāḥ*). The march from stage to stage is progressive, and the four *ās'ramas,* like the four *varṇas,* are all of *equal* importance and they are also interdependent. Society, as represented by the King, has a responsibility as well as an interest in the due maintenance of the social order, which is itself part of a scheme that is behind and beyond the short span of human life. The principles regulating life are embodied in concepts of duty (*Dharma*) ranging from the widest and the most general to the narrowest and individual. The fundamental purpose of education and training is to inculcate the lessons of duty *Dharma*). The science of duty (*Dharmas'āstra*) is the science of life.[1]

[1] I developed the ideas in 1934 in my Calcutta University Lectures, and have repeated them in my *Rājadharma*, 1941.

From these conceptions sprang the belief in the paramount value of *Dharmas'āstra*. Its principles were taught in the schools, and were taught orally. To fix the teaching in the memory, mnemonic devices were adopted. The lessons were strung as a series of aphorisms (*sūtrāṇi*). As the content of *Dharma* is the same for every one, and is immutable, a fundamental unity must exist in the teachings of all schools.[1] But, the schools may vary mnemonic devices, and the adjustment of stress on different aspects of *Dharma*, according to the needs of particular persons or occasions. It leads to *apparent* differences of doctrine in the manuals made up of *sūtras* or easily remembered verses composed for use by different schools. When such differences become numerous or acute, through the multiplication of *Dharma-Sūtras*, the need for reconciliation, comprehension and simplification, for the benefit of persons who cannot depend entirely upon oral tradition and memory, leads to the composition of comprehensive works (*samhitāḥ*). They collect the teachings of the *sūtras*, add the explanatory matter orally given by teachers. and present them in orderly treatises like the *Manu-smṛti* or *Manu-samhitā*. As social life becomes varied and complex, and oral expositions of the *samhitās* on *Dharma* are found to be insufficient for the preservation and promulgation of the principles of *Dharma*, commentaries (*bhāṣyāḥ*) on the *Samhitās* come to be written. The hypothesis that *Dharma* is comprehensive, complete, consistent and suited to *all* possible situations and changes in human life is there always. *Apparent* contradictions in the works on *Dharmas'āstra* can be resolved by the application of rational principles of interpretation (*Mīmāmsā*), which will reveal the underlying consistency. Commentators specialize on the resolution of such 'contradictions' Commentaries come to contain not merely verbal explanations but discussions of fundamental principles and their re-enunciation. A great commentator like Medhātithi or Vijñānes'vara selects a well-known *Samhitā* on *Dharma* like that of Manu or Yājñavalkya and, while professing only to interpret his text, he actually proceeds to summarise the teachings on *Dharmas'āstra* is its entirety, and to make elaborate

[1] "The authors of the Commentaries and Digests assume that the smṛtis constitute a single body of law, one part of which supplements the other, and every part of which, if properly understood, is capable of being reconciled with the others." (*Mayne's Hindu Law*, 10th edition, 1938).

comments in which, by refined and intricate reasoning, reconciliation is sought to be effected between apparently conflicting authorities and the opposition between *Dharma* and recognised usage (*ācāra*). Such commentaries are specially intended for the benefit of the scholar and legist. A simpler *codified* form of *Dharma* is required of the less advanced students. The need is met by verse-summaries of *Dharma* (*Dharma-saṅgrahāḥ*) in which principles are enunciated, differentiated and reconciled.[1] Such a work was composed by Medhātithi but is now lost. To this class belong the versified summaries of the principles of *Dharma* as laid down by the twenty-four (*Catur-vims'ati-mata*) or thirty-six (*Ṣaṭtrims'at-mata*) exponents of tradition (*smṛtikārāḥ*).[2]

The elaboration of devices for the conservation and diffusion of *Dharmasāstra* does not stop even here. The King, as the leader of society, has as his personal responsibility (*Rājadharma*) the obligation *firstly* to understand himself correctly the principles of *Dharma* which should regulate the conduct of every one in the kingdom, and *secondly* to see that those who administer the kingdom, as well as those for whose benefit they administer *Dharma*, have a clear view of their respective duties.[3] The device chosen for realizing this object is the *Nibandha* or the Digest.[4] A conscientious king so educates himself to a mastery of *Dharmasāstra* that he can himself expound *Dharma* in a commentary or digest. So acted Aparārka, who composed (c. 1125 A.D.) a famous commentary on *Yājñavalkyā-Smṛti* and Bhoja Dhāres'vara, who composed a digest a century earlier.[5] Other kings, not so gifted, would commission a learned Minister to compose the digest.[6] The founder of a dynasty, whose rise to supremacy is recent, or whose pretensions to the throne or to *Kṣatriya* lineage are disputable, would try to show his zeal for upholding

[1] *cf.* as a type of the class the now lost *Smṛtisaṅgraha*, which is frequently cited by the *Mitākṣarā*, Aparārka and *Smṛticandrikā* (Kane, pp. 239—242).

[2] Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 223—225 and pp. 237—238.

[3] *See* my lectures on *Rājadharma* (1941) *passim*.

[4] Kane, *op. cit* , p. 247.

[5] Kane, pp. 275—279(Bhoja) and 323—334 (Aparārka).

[6] The *Mitākṣarā*, which is virtually a digest, was obviously commissioned by the Cālukya emperor Vikramāditya VI, as may be seen from its concluding verses. S'ankarabhaṭṭa in his *Dvaitanirṇaya* (c. 1540-1600 A.D.) describes Vijñānes'vara as the most eminent of the *nibandha-kārāḥ*. (Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 247) Aparārka's Commentary is even more like a *nibandha* than the *Mitāks'ārā*.

Dharma by arranging for the composition of a digest.[1] An ambitious prince will now and then try to make up for his relative inferiority in the scale of rulers by undertaking the provision of a digest comparable with those undertaken by rulers of the first rank.[2] In the days in which Hindu society appeared to be threatened with dissolution, owing to the onslaught of enemies of alien race and faith, there was a special inducement to the zealous in the Hindu fold, to re-state in new digests the principles of *Dharmas'āstra.*

These conclusions follow from even a cursory perusal of the history of *Dharmas'āstra.* The *Nibandhas* of Ballālasena (*Sāgara*), Caṇḍes'vara (*Ratnākara*), Madanasiṁha (*Madanaratna*), Dalapati (*Nṛsiṁhaprasāda*), Pratāparudra, Mitra Mis'ra (*Vīramitrodaya*), Anantadeva (*Kaustubha*) and Nīlakanṭha (*Mayūkha*) illustrate them. An ambitious ruler of a new dynasty goes further. He gets a learned Brahman to act as his Chief Minister, entrusts to him the organisation of a Hindu literary and religious revival as well as the composition of a first-class digest of *Dharmas'āstra.* To such aspiration we owe the monumental digest of Hemādri, composed when he held the office of the Minister under Mahādeva, the Yādava King of Devagiri. Mādhavācārya's *Bhāṣya* on *Parās'arasmṛti,* and Vijñānes'vara's *Mitākṣarā,* whose concluding verses glorify the Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI. The work of Dalapati and of Akbar's Revenue Minister Ṭoḍarmal (*Saukhya*)[3] reflect the tolerance of Musulman rulers, who permitted, even if they did not commission digests of *Dharmas'āstra* for the benefit of their Hindu subjects.

LAKṢMĪDHARA'S EMINENCE

Among such works, *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* stands pre-eminent. Its author Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara describes himself as the Chief Minister for Peace and War (*Mahā-sāndhi-vigrahika*) of Mahārājādhirāja Govinda-candra-deva, and as the son of Bhaṭṭa Hṛdayadhara, who had held the same office. In the brief

[1] *cf.*, Govindacandra of Kanauj or Bukka I of Vijayanagara.

[2] *e.g.* Madanasiṁha, Bhagavanta of Bhareha, Bīrsingh of Orchha, Bāz Bahadur-Candra of Kumaon etc.

[3] Kane, pp. 421—423. The seven *Saukhyas* of his digest are collectively known as *Ṭoḍarānanda.*

introductory verses[1] prefixed to each of the sections of his Digest, he bases his competence to deal with the matters comprised in the section, on his possession of the appropriate qualities, as *adhikāra* for undertaking to write on it. Thus, he claims to have been trained in the austere school of *brahmacarya* before he became a householder (*gṛhastha*), and devoted himself to the studies and ritual prescribed for Brahmans. He had performed the prescribed daily baths and *yajñas*, and omitted the timely performance of no rite prescribed for a *s'rotriya*.[2] With piety, he had propitiated his ancestors (*pitṛgaṇa*) by the due performance of *s'rāddhas*. He had 'purified the earth' by the excavation of tanks, the planting of trees, and the foundation of villages given as gifts to learned Brahmans, and in other ways illustrated in his own life the duty to make gifts (*dāna*). The rest-houses, which he had constructed on the routes leading to holy places (*tīrtha*) were crowded with the devout pilgrims who had undertaken the toilsome journeys to wash away their sins. By his performance of expiatory rites he had become the luminary of *Dharma*, by whose light the world guided itself. It was owing to *his* wise counsel that Govindacandra trod the path of righteousness, and attained supremacy over many kings. By his mastery of the different branches of learning, by his eloquence, and by his trained intellect, he had attained the capacity to expound, as a judge, the intricacies of law in such a way as to win the spontaneous admiration of the learned men who crowded his court. When, as Chief Minister, he undertook 'the *yajña* (sacrifice) of the protection of the world (*vis'va-pālana*),' the virtuous subjects (*sādhavaḥ*) attained prosperity (*puṣṭi*) and calmness of mind (*s'ānti*). By his own studies in philosophy and *s'āstra* he had attained an unmatched capacity to expound them in such a way as to help the good to overcome the darkness

[1] These are printed with a translation at the end of this general introduction.

[2] Yājñavalkya (I, 111) distinguishes between *s'rotriya* and *vedapāragaḥ*. The *Mitākṣarā* explains the distinction: One who has *studied* one *Sākhā* of the Veda thoroughly is a *Srotriya*, and one who can *teach* one *S'ākhā* is a *vedapāragaḥ*. This follows Baudhāyana: एकां शाखामधीत्य श्रोत्रियो भवति. Āpastamba would make the successive mastery of the Vedas one by one the test: धर्मेण वेदानाश्च एकैक-मधीत्य श्रोत्रियो भवति. Tarkavācaspati, following Bhavabhūti (*Mālatimādhava*, I, 5) makes *ācāra* षड्कर्मनिरतो नित्यं the test. V. N. Māṇḍlik follows Āpastamba, but misquotes Vijñānes'vara's definition of *vedapāraga* (Trn. of Yājñavalkya, p. 176 n.)

of delusion (*māyātamaḥ*) and achieve the happiness of ultimate release from re-birth (*Mokṣa*).

Stripped of poetical imagery, the verses in which the qualities of the author are described by himself, amount to this. Lakṣmīdhara was by birth a *s'rotriya* whose family had attained to the dignity of being termed *Bhaṭṭas*. He was born and lived in affluence. The position of Chief Minister, which he came to occupy, had been held previously by his father. Apparently, the Gāhaḍvāla dynasty, to which his master Govindacandra belonged, acted on the ancient precept that kings should employ only those whose ancestors had shown marked fidelity to the kingdom.[1] The inscriptions of the dynasty show that this principle was followed in other appointments also. For example, a considerable number of copper-plate grants discovered at Kamauli (now in the Lucknow Museum) show that the office of Chief Priest (*Mahāpurohita*) at Benares was hereditary in the family of Dīkṣita Jāgūs'arman, to whom most of the grants were made.[2] Either as Chief Minister or previously as Chief Justice, Lakṣmīdhara had proved an efficient administrator. By his prowess he had reduced the king's enemies to beggary and misery.[3] He had made extensive benefactions as ordained by the *s'āstras* which he expounded. His claim to many-sided learning is fully borne out by his Digest which not only displays a mastery of *Purāṇa* and *Smṛti*, as pointed by Mr. Kane, but shows that he was a *Mīmāṁsaka* profoundly learned in the *Veda*.[4]

LAKṢMĪDHARA'S LEARNING

The bounds of his knowledge cannot be discovered merely from his quotations. True to the convention that a *Dharma-Nibandha*

[1] स मन्त्रिणः प्रकुर्वीत प्राज्ञान् मौलान् स्थिरान् शुचीन् (Yājñavalkya, I, 312).

[2] *See* the Kamauli plate of Vijayacandra and the Yuvarāja Jayacandra *Saṁvat*, 1224 (*Epig. Ind.* IV, pp. 118 ft.).

[3] विश्रान्ताः विमुखाः क्षतेन्द्रियसुखाः क्ष्मातल्पनिद्रालवो
भिक्षावृत्तिजुषस्त्वचा परिचिताः कौपनीमात्राम्बराः ।
नीताः कालवशेन यस्य रिपवः तद्ब्रह्मचर्यं परं
काण्डे स प्रथमाश्रमे प्रथमतः प्रस्तौति लक्ष्मीधरः ॥

[4] Mr. P. V. Kane's statement that the *Kalpataru* "generally quotes *only* the *Smṛti* writers, the epics and the *purāṇas*" (*op. cit*, p. 317) overlooks his many Vedic citations. *See* Appendix C *infra*.

should rely on no authority which was not s'āstraic, Lakṣmīdhara confines his quotations to *s'rauta* and *smārta* literature, the great epics (*itihāsa*) and *purāṇa*, and refers only occasionally to the views of previous writers on *Dharma*.[1] Even without his explicit references to *Kumārila* (as *Bhaṭṭapāda*) and S'ābrasvāmin, his proficiency in *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsa*, so necessary for the study, understanding and exposition of *Dharmas'āstra*, is evident throughout his work. His interpretations of philosophical passages from the Upaniṣads and the *Bhagavad-Gītā* as well as the *Vedānta-Sūtra* in the *Mokṣa-kāṇḍa* show his conversancy with the older commentaries. In the notes, which I am appending to my edition of the *Mokṣa-kāṇḍa*, I am giving passages from the commentaries of S'aṅkara and Rāmānuja, which he *may* have had in mind when he gave his own interpretations of important texts. On only *two* occasions does he cite a lay authority In the *S'ānti-kāṇḍa* he quotes Varāhamihira ; and in *Naiyata-kāla-kāṇḍa* he quotes an unnamed work on astrology (*Jyotis's'āstra*). Unlike the authors of later digests, who crowd their pages with indiscriminate citations, Lakṣmīdhara shows restraint in quotation, and discriminates between the available authorities, using only those whose authenticity or authority is indisputable. Among the eighteen major *Purāṇas*, he lays under contribution only twelve, ignoring the other six. The *Purāṇas* he has not quoted are *Viṣṇu-Dharmottara*, *Bhāgavata*, *Āgneya*, *Brahma-vaivarta*, *Kūrma*, *Nāradīya*, and *Gāruḍa*. These were all known to Al-biruni, who wrote a century before Lakṣmīdhara.[2] The rejection of *Viṣṇu-Dharmottara* (which Hemādri and Mitra Mis'ra freely use) shows that, in his view, it was not an authentic portion of the *Vaiṣṇava-purāṇa*. He quotes extensively from five *Upa-purāṇas* namely the *Nṛsimha*, *Āditya*, *Devī*, *Kālikā* and *Nandī*. No copy of the last named *upa-purāṇa* is now traceable.[3] The published *S'aura-purāṇa* does not contain any of the passages cited by Lakṣmīdhara from the *Āditya-Purāṇa*. The two must be different. It may be noted that the *Matsya-Purāṇa*

[1] Later writers were not so scrupulous. Thus, Nilakaṇṭha cites Cāṇakya and Kāmandaka in his *Nīti-mayūkha*.

[2] See Sachau's trn., I, pp. 130-131. Al Biruni includes among the *mahā-purāṇas* the *Āditya*, *Narasiṁha-purāṇa* and the *Nandapurana*, which Lakṣmīdhara quotes frequently.

[3] See my article on Nandīpurāṇa, in *New Indian Antiquary*, Vol. IV, part 5, pp. 157-161.

(LIII, 60) mentions only four *upa-purāṇas* namely the *Nārasiṁha*, *Nandi*, *Sāmba* and *Āditya*. The *Kūrma-purāṇa* gives a list of *upa-purāṇas*, which omits the *purāṇas* named after Nandi and Devī (I, 1, 17-20). The citation of *upa-purāṇas* side by side with *maha-purāṇas, as equally* authoritative shows that in Lakṣmīdhara's view, or in his day, the former were not regarded as in any way inferior to the latter.[1]

Certain ancient *smṛti* writers, whose works are now lost, are referred to by Lakṣmīdhara. They are Bhāguri, Bhartṛ-yajña (who is quoted by Medhātithi), Jayasvāmī (who is once mentioned by Raghunandana), Mādhavasvāmī,[2] and an unknown writer named Utathyatanaya.[3] When these writers are cited by writers later than Lakṣmīdhara, they clearly do so without a personal knowledge of the authors quoted, and appear to borrow the references second-hand from the *Kalpataru*. Lakṣmīdhara naturally respects the authority of Medhātithi, who is quoted in three *kāṇḍas*, as well as of Vis'varūpa, the earliest extant commentator on Yājñavalkya. He knows a Hārīta-Bhāṣyakāra, from whom Hemādri has quoted a passage, to which Mr. Kane has drawn a attention, but it occurs in the *Srāddha Kāṇḍa* of the *Kalpataru*, from which Hemādri obviously took it without acknowledgment.[4] He refers to a *Bhāratabhāva-prakās'akāra*, whose work has not survived.[5] His scrupulous honesty compels him to refer to the views of six earlier *Nibhandas*, which are now totally lost to us: *Mahārṇava*, *Prakās'a*, *Pārijāta*, *Kāmadhenu*,

[1] Ballāla-sena (c. 1069 A.D.) was almost as critical in his citation of Purāṇic literature. *Devīpurāṇa*, which he rejects as unorthodox, is much relied on by the *Kalpataru* which cites it as an authority. See the extracts from *Dānasāgara* on pp. 337—343 *infra*. The equal validity of the two classes of Purāṇas is the thesis of Dr. R. C. Hazra (*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 1940, pp. 38—62).

[2] (c 600 A.D.) See Dr. C. Kunhan Rāja's edn. of his *Rigveda-bhaṣya*, 1939. Madhavasvāmi is probably the vedic commentator.

[3] *Smṛticandrikā* cites a Utathya as the author of a *Smṛti*. For *four* of the above writers *See* Kane, *passim*. Manu mentions a Utathyatanaya, (III, 16). Utathya is represented in the *Mahābhārata* as a son of Angiras and brother of Bṛhaspati and Samvarta (*Ādi*., 67, 5; *Anu*., 132, 42). His wife was Mamatā, and her son by Utathya was the blind Dirghatamas (*Anu*., 113, 22). Bṛhaspati raped her, and the son of the union was Bharadvāja (*Viṣṇupurāṇa*, IV, 19). On the rule that the owner of the 'soil' is the owner of the fruit, Bharadvāja may be regarded as *Utathya-tanaya*.

[4] Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

[5] Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, editor of the *Mahābhārata*, tells me that he has not come across this commentary, which must be ancient.

Mālā and a work of Halāyudha, who appears to be different from the author of *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*.[1]

LAKṢMĪDHARA'S PATRON, GOVINDACANDRA

Govindacandra's inscriptions run for nearly half a century from 1104 A.D. to 1154 A.D.[2] His grand-father Candradeva, who is said to have conquered Kanauj,[3] and who is described as "the protector of holy places of Kās'ī, Kus'ika, Uttarakosala, and the city of Indra," claims to have been an ardent and generous patron of Brahmans. Numerous land grants are to his credit. In one case, a grant of his grand-father is to 500 Brahmans.[4] Madanapāla, (c. 1090 A.D.) the son and successor of Candradeva and the father of Govindacandra, does not appear to have taken any active part in the government of his kingdom. His grants are made in his name either by his son Govindacandra as Yuvarāja or by one of his queens. Such a grant, made in 1105 A.D. states explicitly that it was sanctioned by Govindacandra's mother.[5] She was probably Regent, and it is not unlikely that Madanapāḷa was a prisoner at that time in the hands of the Musulmans. An inscription of Govindacandra (1109 A.D.) states that he inflicted repeated defeats on the Muhammadan Amīr (Hāmmīra).[6] The Sarnāth inscription states that he was Viṣṇu Himself incarnated to protect Benares from the wicked *Turuṣka*.[7] The references in these inscriptions are apparently to the expedition which King Māsud III of Ghāzni (1098-1115 A.D.) sent against "the capital of Hind, the Kāāba of the Shamins and Kibla of the Infidels." The ruler of Kanauj

[1] Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 293—301 and 306—309 See *infra* Note B (Nibandhas before the *Kalpataru*).

[2] R. S. Tripāṭhi, *History of Kanauj*, 1937, pp. 386—7, and *Catalogue of Inscriptions in the Lucknow Museum*, 1915, pp. 10—29.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, *XVIII*, p. 18.

[4] Lucknow *Catalogue*, *op. cit.*, p. 9 and *Epig. Ind. XIV*, p. 192 (*Candrāvati* plates of Candradeva, 1096 A.D.)

[5] Lucknow *Catatlogue*, p. 10, and Tripāṭhi, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

[6] *Ind. Ant. XVIII*, pp. 16—18. It does not mention its approval by any one else.

[7] *Epig. Ind.*, *IX*, pp. 324—27.

वाराणसीं भुवनरक्षणदक्ष एको दुष्टात्तुरुष्कसुभटादवितुं हरेण ।
उक्तो हरिः स पुनरत्र बभूव तस्माद् गोविन्दचन्द्र इति प्रथिताभिधानः ॥

is stated by the Muhammadan historian to have suffered serious reverses, and to have been "compelled to ransom his person by a large sum of money."[1] Govindacandra turned the tables on the Muhammadans and drove them beyond the confines of the kingdom of Kanauj. He appears to have extended his dominions into Magadha and to have fought a successful campaign against the ruler of Das'ārna. The Gāgāha plate claims that he (1142 A.D.) captured the elephants of nine kings and made himself the leading monarch in Jambū-dvīpa.[2] According to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* he entered into friendship with Jayasiṁha of Kāṣmīr (1128-1149 A.D.)[3] and deputed a scholar named Suhaḷa to attend a *pariṣad* convened by the Kāṣmirian Minister Alaṅkāra (*S'rīkaṇṭhacarita*).[4] Govindacandra entered into diplomatic relations with Siddharāja-Jayasimha of Gujarat[5] and with his powerful contemporary Kulottunga-Cola (1070-1120 A.D.)[6] These alliances would suggest some tension of feeling between Govindacandra and Vikramāditya VI (1076 A.D. 1125 A.D.) the powerful ruler of the Dakhan.

LAKṢMĪDHARA'S SERVICES TO HIS KING

The opening verses of the *Kalpataru* allude to the victorious campaign of Govindacandra against the Muhammadans. A s'loka introducing the *Rājadharma-kāṇḍa* justifies Lakṣmīdhara's title to expound Rājadharma by pointedly claiming that Govindacandra's benevolent rule and conquests of many kings were entirely due to

[1] Tripāṭhi, *op. cit.*, 318.

[2] *Epig. Ind.*, *XIII*, p. 218. The same claim is made in earlier grants e.g. Maner copper-plate of 1125-26 A.D., *J.B.O.R.S.*, 1916, pp. 441-447.

[3] प्रजेशाः कान्यकुब्जादावजर्येण नृपार्यमा ।
सव्यधाद्भव्यभूभोगवैभवानभिमानिनः ॥

VIII, 2453, (ed. Durgāprasāda).

[4] अन्यस्स सुहलस्तेन ततोऽवन्द्यत पण्डितः ।
दूतो गोविन्दचन्द्रस्य कान्यकुब्जस्य भूभुजः ॥ XXV, 102.

[5] *Prabandha-cintāmani*, *III*, 121. Jayasimha, reigned from c. 1093 to 1143 A.D.

[6] An incomplete Gāhaḍvāla inscription, dated in the 41st year of Kulottunga, gives the Kanauj *pras'asti*. "The increased emphasis on Sun-worship in the Cola country in Kulottunga's reign may be due to the close association with the Gāhaḍvālas, who were great worshippers of the Sun." (K. A. Nilakaṇṭha Sāstri, *Colas*, II, 1937, p. 40).

the merit of his advice as Minister.[1] In the introductory verses of the *Kalpataru*, Lakṣmīdhara claims that he made his King rule over 'the Sea-girt earth'[2] and that by his resolute fighting myriads of his King's enemies were destroyed. Such declarations, in a work written by the command of a powerful ruler like Govindacandra and certain to be perused by him, could not have been made by even a favourite Minister unless his services were of such an outstanding character that a public recital of them before the reigning king was allowable. The value of the restrained statements of his accomplishments and services, which Lakṣmīdhara makes in the very brief introductions to the different parts of his Digest, consists in showing that he was not only a great and devout scholar of massive learning and subtle intellect, but that he was also a soldier, administrator and diplomatist, born and bred in an atmosphere of public affairs. In this respect, he should be ranked higher than even a great jurist like Vijñāneśvara, and only with scholar-statesmen like Mādhavācārya, or Caṇḍeśvara, or Cāṇakya.

The reference in the *Kalpataru* to Govindacandra's victories over the Muhammadans occurs at the *beginning* of the *first Kāṇḍa*, while the allusion to his diplomatic successes and wise counsel to his king occurs at the beginning of the *eleventh* section of the Digest. It is therefore, tempting to surmise that Lakṣmīdhara, as befits the son of a Prime Minister, was the trusted companion and friend of Govindacandra; when he was Yuvarāja in the life-time of his father Madanapāla, and that the appointment of Lakṣmīdhara both as Prime Minister and as the scholar deputed for the composition of a digest of *Dharma*, which might fitly usher in the glorious reign of an ambitious and pious ruler, who had already displayed the qualities of a successful soldier and skilled administrator in the troubled reign of his father, synchronised with the *accession* of Govindacandra. That the percepts which Lakṣmīdhara put into the *Kalpataru* were actually followed is evident from the inscriptions of Govindacandara as well as those of his two immediate predecessors and successors.[3]

[1] तत्सर्वं खलु यस्य मन्त्रमहिमाश्चर्यं स लक्ष्मीधरः.

[2] पृथ्वीं साधयतः समुद्रवसनाम्.

[3] Tripāṭhi, *op. cit.*, pp. 337—359.

Revivalist Origin of the Kalpataru

The Gāhaḍvālas sprang into eminence suddenly. They were so to speak *parvenus*.[1] A ruler of an old and well-established dynasty does not feel the urge, which one of a new dynasty does, to commemorate his entry into the ranks of powerful monarchs by some notable action that would capture contemporary imagination and leave a permanent impress of his reign on history. Temples or monuments of brick or stone however nobly planned, cannot outlast a great contribution to letters or thought. It was in this belief that Govindacandra must have planned the compilation of a great digest of *Dharma*, at a time when there was a danger of its perishing, along with the Hindu kingdoms, before the onslaught of a ruthless and powerful enemy of an alien race and faith. It was in the same spirit that Bukka I of the newly founded kingdom of Vijayanagara ordered (*ādis'at*) Mādhavācārya to explain the meaning of the Veda (*Vedārthasya-prakās'ane*) and to compose for the guidance of himself and his successors a monumental commentary on *Parās'ara-s'mṛti*, the *Dharma-s'āstra* specially recommended for the Iron Age (*Kali-Yuga*). The addition of an elaborate treatise on *Vyavahāra* to this commentary by Mādhavācārya, and his tacking it to the brief statement in the *Smṛti* that 'the king should protect his subjects and his kingdom through *Dharma*'[2] is in harmony with the hypothesis that the statements in a *Smṛti* require to be supplemented and elucidated by traditional interpretations, so as to make good the many apparent omissions or gaps.

Uniqueness of the Kalpataru

Among digests, the *Kalpataru* occupies a unique position. Its author was a scholar-statesman. He was a critical and conscientious compiler, discriminating between his sources and scrupulous about the purity of his texts. The high reputation which the *Kalpataru* commanded in later times for its scholarship

[1] "The Gāhaḍvālas emerge into the light of history so suddenly that it is difficult to clear away the obscurity hanging over their origin." (Tripāṭhi, *op. cit.*, p. 296.)

[2] क्षत्रियस्तु प्रजारक्षन् क्षितिं धर्मेण पालयेत् ।

as well as its critical acumen may be illustrated. Thus, in discussing the value of his authorities, Mitra Mis'ra (*Vīramitrodaya, Paribhāṣā-prākāsa*) justifies his recognition of a *Smṛtisaṅgraha* on the ground that it had been accepted (*parigṛhītam*) by the *Kalpataru*. It is curious that the work in question does not appear to be quoted anywhere in the *Kalpataru*. That, however, is immaterial to the argument; it was sufficient for Hindu legists to be told that the *Kalpataru* had admitted the authority. Such a declaration would have shut the mouth of possible objectors. Any reading accepted by Lakṣmīdhara, even if opposed to the texts available to later commentators and digest-makers, was never rejected. It was either accepted or explained away. Lakṣmīdhara's skill lay in selecting the necessary texts and stringing them together. He interpolates a rare comment or interpretation. So much value was attached to his selective capacity and his occasional elucidation of a word or a passage here and there, that later writers invariably reproduced his citations as well as his annotations without altering a syllable. Finality was held to attach to whatever he had written.[1]

Its Plan

In *two* other respects also the *Kalpataru* is unique. Firstly, it is distinguished by having been written in accordance with a well-conceived and logical plan. A digest must be true to the underlying principles of Hindu life. A cursory reading of even a comprehensive *smṛti* like that of Manu or Yājñavalkya will fail to disclose the background of Hindu life. Lakṣmīdhara so planned his *Nibandha* that it followed the natural sequence of life, in its different stages and activities, as laid down in the *S'āstras*. To a Hindu, life commences with conception and marches through the prescribed four stages or *ās'ramas* to the final release (*Mokṣa*), which crowns a life properly lived. The *Kalpataru* is

[1] This is his own claim :

एकार्थेष्वेकमेकं, क्वचिदपरमपि स्वीकृतं, कार्ययोगात्,
न्यस्तं विज्ञानमूलं, प्रचरदपि परित्यक्तमज्ञानमूलम् ।
शिष्टैस्सम्यग्गृहीतं वचनमभिहितं, स्पष्टितं चाऽस्फुटार्थं
यत्राऽपरो विरोधः स्फुरति विरचिता तेन तत्र व्यवस्था ॥

accordingly divided into *fourteen* books or *kāṇḍas*, and each book is divided into chapters or *parvas*. At the beginning of each book, Lakṣmīdhara recites the headings of the chapters as a declaration (*pratijñā*) of what he intends to set down in that book. Each book follows its predecessor in a natural sequence which will be apparent even in a mere enumeration. They are grouped and were probably written in the following order :

1. *Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa* commences with *Paribhāṣā* (definitions) and traces the duties of a boy up to the end of *Brahmacarya*.
2. *Gṛhastha-kāṇḍa* the duties of the householder, including the rites of marriage which precede the entry into the *Gṛhasthāśrama*.
3. *Naiyata-kāla or Āhnika-kāṇḍa* on the daily ritual to be followed by a house-holder.
4. *S'rāddha-kāṇḍa* on the ceremonies to be done for propitiating ancestors (*pitṛs*).
5. *Dāna-kāṇḍa* on the religious gifts the making of which is an obligation laid on *gṛhasthas*.
6. *Pratiṣṭhā-kāṇḍa* on the consecration of idols etc.
7. *Pūjā-kāṇḍa*,[1] dealing with the ritual of worship.
8. *Tīrtha-kāṇḍa* on pilgrimages to sacred places.
9. *Vrata-kāṇḍa* dealing with the performances of the periodical *vratas*.[2]
10. *S'uddhi-kāṇḍa* on purification.
11. *Rājadharma-kāṇḍa* dealing with the specific obligations of princes.
12. *Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa* on Civil law and procedure.
13. *S'ānti-kāṇḍa* on the propitiatory rites.
14. *Mokṣa-kāṇḍa* dealing with the steps necessary for salvation.[3]

Of the three debts (*ṛṇatraya*) with which man is born and which he has to discharge in this life, the means of discharging

[1] The subject of this section of which no MS. had been known till I discovered one in January 1939 in the Bhonsle Raj Library at Nagpur was correctly surmised by M M. Chakravarti (*J. B. A. S.*, 1916, p. 359).

[2] M. M. Chakravarti, *op. cit.*, p. 359 wrote: "In the *Malamasa* and *Prāyas'ccitta tattvas*, Raghunandana quotes a *Prāyas'ccitta-kāṇḍa-kalpataru*. That Lakṣmīdhara wrote on *Prāyas'ccitta* is clear from the *Prāyas'ccittaviveka* of of S'ūlapāṇi." But, I discovered *Vrata-kāṇḍa* at Nagpur, which fills the gap. The Asiatic Society in Calcutta has a fragment of a *Prāyas'citta-Kalpataru*.

[3] Only one other digest, *viz.*, the *Vīramitrodaya* deals with *Mokṣa*.

the first, the debt to seers, are set out in the first *kāṇḍa*, dealing with *brahmacarya*, that of discharging the second (*pitṛ-ṛṇam*), the debt to ancestors in the second, third and fourth *kāṇḍas*, dealing with *gṛhastha-dharma*, *āhnika* and *s'rāddha*, and the third, the debt to the Gods, (*deva-ṛṇam*) by the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth *kāṇḍas* dealing with gifts, dedication, worship, pilgrimages vows, as 'means of grace' to attain the mental peace (*S'ānti*), which is preliminary to the final release (*Mokṣa*), and which form the subjects of the tenth and fourteenth *kāṇḍas*. The eleventh and twelfth *kāṇḍas* deal with the civil environment in which a man has to live and function, and its attunement to the needs of the progress to ultimate beatitude.

No other digest has essayed so logical and so comprehensive a presentation of the revealed laws of life. When finished, the *Kalpataru* must have provided a complete and authoritative survey of Hindu *Dharma* made for the benefit of posterity. It is tragic that so noble a work should have almost perished in the calamities attending the early Muhammadan conquests.

ITS SIZE

The comprehensive range outlined for it, has made the complete *Kalpataru* a work of great volume, in spite of the obvious attempts by Lakṣmīdhara at brevity. He not only eschews unnecessary comment, but in sections dealing with religious rites, he contents himself with a bare indication of the *mantras* to be used and the rituals to be followed, without giving in full the *prayoga* for the benefit of the officiating priests (*purohita*). He does not repeat in one *Kāṇḍa* what is dealt with in another. The underlying assumption in the *Kalpataru* is that it will be used only by trained scholars, who could be trusted to understand it without commentary, and who would be able to act upon the briefest hints for selecting the appropriate *mantras* or *prayoga*. The cumbersome growth of later digests, dealing with matters already dealt with by the *Kalpataru*, is largely due to the addition of material, which Lakṣmīdhara was content to leave to the priest with bare indications.[1] When

[1] The *Dānasāgara*, which Ballālasena composed 'with the help of Aniruddhabhaṭṭa in 1169 A.D., in the generation following Lakṣmīdhara's, quoted *in extenso* all the *mantras* to be used in making gifts, while the *Kalpataru* merely names them.

learning and priest came to be divorced, full description of *prayoga* became necessary, and the cumbersome digests of Hemādri, Madanasiṃha and Mitra Mis'ra came to be preferred to the more restrained *Kalpataru*. Even with these self-imposed restrictions, Lakṣmīdhara's work attained a size, which makes it stand only second to the *Vīramitrodaya* in bulk.[1] Its *vyavahāra-kāṇḍa* is among the larger treatises on the subject. But, in studying it, as in studying any other part of the *Kalpataru*, the underlying unity of the entire work must be borne in mind, and for explanations or matter, which may be wanting in one part we must learn to turn to another. The *Kalpataru* like every *Dharma-saṃhitā*, was designed to be studied as a whole, and not in separate self-contained sections.[2]

It is not necessary, to describe in advance the specific doctrines of Lakṣmīdhara. The textual difficulties in the way of editing it virtually compel the study of the vast literature of *Dharmas'āstra*.[3] When completed, the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* will also provide ample material to those who endeavour to reconstruct either the lost codes, whose number is 'legion,' or the authentic text of Purāṇas and Epics, which have come to us in forms so different from those in use, when they were laid under contribution by great lawyers and scholiasts, like the forgotten Minister of the last independent Hindu emperor of North India.

[1] Its *fourteen* volumes contain about thirty-thousand *granthas*, *i.e.*, about one-third the size of the *Mahabhārata*. The *Vīramitrodaya* is in twenty-two parts.

[2] The distortion of Hindu Law by modern lawyers and judges is due to their viewing *vyavahāra* apart from other sections of *Dharma Sastra* and an unwarranted distrust of the *Mīmaṁsā* rules of interpretation. Cf. *Mayne's Hindu Law*, 10th edition, pp. 41-42.

[3] The library of H. H. the Mahārāna of Udaipur contains a set of the *Kalpataru* in which the seventh and ninth parts are wanting. Fragments of the *Kalpataru* have been found in some libraries, but for certain *kāṇḍas* like the first, seventh, the ninth and the thirteenth, we have now to depend upon solitary, defective and incorrect manuscripts. In preparing my edition of the *Kalpataru*, I have tried to secure every known manuscript of any portion of it and have found that some which had been in existence sixty years ago are now lost beyond recovery. The editing of a work of such importance from one or two manuscripts is very difficult. Help has, however, come from an unexpected quarter. The thoroughness with which whole passages from the *Kalpataru* have been appropriated by later authors like Hemādri, Caṇḍes'vara and Mitra-Mis'ra makes it possible to fill up gaps in our text or clear up obscurities caused by copyists. Nevertheless the task is formidable.

LAKṢMĪDHARA, VIJÑĀNES'VARA AND APARĀRKA

Lakṣmīdhara is as eminent among the authors of digests (*nibandha*) as the author of the *Mitākṣarā* is among commentators. By a curious coincidence, both were contemporaries, and each was commissioned by a powerful ruler, who claimed *sāmrājya*, to compose a *Dharmas'āstra* work, which would prove a fit monument of the reign of the patron. Another famous commentator, Aparārka or Aparāditya of the S'ilāhāra dynasty of Konkan, was also a contemporary of the other two great *smārtas*. How far they were coeval we have no means of ascertaining with certainty. Vijñānes'vara is considered as having made no reference in his great commentary to either of his rivals. It has also been assumed that he is the oldest of the three, and wrote his work along before the other two started their compositions. In regard to Aparārka's silence about the *Mitākṣarā*, of which his ignorance cannot bo presumed, as he was so close a neighbour of Vijñānes'vara's patron Vikramāṅka or Vikrāmāditya VI of the Cālukya dynasty of Kalyāṇa (c. A.D. 1076 to 1127) it was suggested by Jolly in 1883 that " the fact that he never mentions the *Mitākṣarā* by name, has been explained as a result of Indian etiquette, which does not allow a royal author to notice expressly the opinions of another sovereign's servant by name." Mr. P. V. Kane [1] rejects the suggestion and points out that " it is doubtful whether any such etiquette ever existed," and that " works of royal authors such as the *Madanapārijāta* or the *Sarasvativilāsa* do not appear to have followed the rule." Mr. Kane also points out [2] that Aparārka " studiously avoids the mention of every ancient commentator."

THREE CONTEMPORARY EMPERORS

The reign of Lakṣmīdhara's patron, the Gāhadvāla ruler Govindacandra of Kānauj, extended from about A.D. 1110 to 1154, the date of his latest extant record. But, during the

[1] *History of Hindu Law*, 1885, p. 13 ; *Journal of Hindu History*, III, p. 17.

[2] *History of Dharmas'astra*, Vol. I, 1930, p. 330. Lakṣmīdhara must have known the work of *Bhoja* of Dhāra, whom he never cites. His silence may support Jolly's theory.

nominal reign of his father Madanapāla (A. D. 1099 to 1110) he was actually exercising the functions of a sovereign, and there is a record of a gift which he made in that capacity bearing a date equivalent to A. D. 1104.[1] Along with the two powerful rulers of Hindusthan and the Dakhan, mention must be made of an equally powerful and eminent contemporary ruler, the Coḷa emperor, Kulottunga I (A. D. 1070 to 1120), who ruled the whole of the peninsula south of the Tungabhadra, along with a considerable portion of the old Vengi kingdom of the Eastern Cālukya dynasty.[2]

It is noteworthy that each of these powerful kings ruled for about half a century, that they were all ambitious and warlike as well as extremely capable, and that the comparative peace which India enjoyed for about three generations was largely the result of the wholesome respect that each of these had for the power of the others. They were all patrons of letters. None of the three was young when he ascended his throne, and had no previous administrative experience. It is valid to assume an intense feeling of emulation among the three kings, and there is evidence to show that their diplomatic activities were directed to produce one another's encirclement.

TIME RELATION OF THE THREE SMĀRTAS

The conditions must have strongly favoured the movement of ideas, as represented in capital literary works, throughout India in such times, even if we did not know that the tireless march of pilgrims to the *tīrthas* scattered over India should have

[1] The Basahi plate of *Maharājaputra* Govindacandra, *Ind. Ant.*, XIV, pp. 101-104; R.S. Tripaṭhi, *History of Kanauj*, 1935, p. 305.

The earliest extant record of Govindacandra *as king* is the Kamauli plate of V.S. 1171, bearing a date equivalent to the 15th October, 1114, (*Epig. Ind.*, IV, pp. 101-103), but it is probable that he came to the throne in A D. 1110 four years earlier. The Rāhan copper-plate of Madanapāla and Govindacandra dated V.S. 1166 (3rd January 1109 A.D.) purports to be issued by command of Govindacandra himself and contains an injunction to implement the gift to *Raja-rajñi-mantri-purohita-amātya-akṣapaṭalaka-bhandagarika-bhiṣak-senapaty-antaḥpurika-samasta-dhikaripuruṣadim*, though Govindacandra is still designated as *Maharajaputra* only. It ends with an allocution on the transitoriness of life and the merit of gifts, and does not state as in the plate of A.D. 1104 that it received the concurrence of the Queen or any one else. The designation applied to Govindacandra is *Mahārājaputra*, not *Yuvarāja*, as in the Basahi plate of A.D. 1104 (*Ind. Ant.*, XIV, pp. 100—104; *J.A.S.B.*, XLII, pp. 314—321).

[2] Nilakantha Sastri, *Colas*, II, pp. 38—39.

facilitated the exchange of ideas and the rapid circulation of books of merit. Further, when a great king commissions the composition of a digest, or a commentary which would be as good as a digest of *Dharmas'āstra*, it is natural to presume that no effort would be spared to place all available material, including the latest, before the authors entrusted with so responsible a duty. The point needs some emphasis, as it is usually assumed, that the percolation of views in books takes at least a generation to reach countries other than those in which they were written. The history of *Dharmas'āstra* in India negatives such a view. It is therefore unnecessary to assign arbitrarily, on such an assumption, fairly long intervals between two works, which are believed to be connected by one alluding to or borrowing from the other, to allow of this penetration. Mr. Kane has, for instance, acted in this manner. He holds that the *Mitākṣarā* "must have been composed at the latest before 1100 A.D.," because "Vijñānes'vara is named in the *Kalpataru*," which he holds as having been composed in the second quarter of the 12th century, and "the *Kalpataru* also mentions Vādibhayaṃkara (*sic*)" a writer supposed to have been, on the authority of the *Vīramitrodaya* a follower and critic of Vijñānes'vara. On somewhat similar grounds among others the composition of Aparārka's commentary is put at about 1125, almost the date assigned by Mr. Kane to the composition of the *Kalpataru*.[1]

[1] The point is illustrated by Lakṣmidhara's reference to Gopāla, the author of the *Kāmadhenu* as his *vayasya*, *i.e.*, contemporary and friend, in mentioning previous works compared with which his own *Kalpataru* is markedly superior. Mr. Kane, (*op. cit.*, p. 296), places Gopāla at least a generation before Lakṣmidhara, and assigns him to the period between 1000 and 1100 A.D.

The references are worth quoting in full :

पौराणीरेव वाणिः क्वचिदकृतकृतौ क्वापि भूयस्स्मृतीनां
गोपालस्तद्वयस्यः स्वकृतिविरचनं वाक्यरूपेण चक्रे ।
श्रौतस्मार्तादिसारैः विबुधजनमनोहारिकारिष्यतेऽयं
मीमांसोत्तासितार्थैः अपृथुरथकथाऽतीतरन्ध्रः प्रबन्धः ॥
यस्योत्थितौ स्थितिमती न महार्णवेश्रीः
निद्रां दधाति यदधः किल कामधेनुः ।
तस्यास्तनिष्यति रतिं विबुधद्विजानां
आनन्दितुं किमु न कल्पतरोः प्ररोहः ॥

APARĀRKA'S DATE

Thus for the determination of the dates[1] of these cardinal works our reliance must be mainly on internal evidence of borrowing or obligation and the dates of the royal patrons. We may leave out the work of Aparārka, which must have been composed when he was a king (A.D. 1110 to 1140) and when he was in the height of his power and prosperity, which would narrow the limits further, as we know that after a disastrous war with the Kadamba king of Goa, Jayakeśin II (*circa* 1104 to c. 1147-8), in which he lost and regained most of his territories in North Konkan, he had the needed peace of mind for such an undertaking as the composition of his famous commentary only after 1126, and concentrate our attention on the *Mitākṣarā* and *Kalpataru*.[2]

ALLEGED REFERENCE TO VIJÑĀNEŚVARA IN THE KALPATARU

Mr. Kane discovered two allusions to the author of the *Mitākṣarā* in a *modern* transcript of the *Vyavahārakāṇḍa* of the *Kalpataru* in the Sarasvatībhavan at Benares. This transcript, which I have had occasion to utilise, is obviously a copy of a manuscript in fairly *modern* characters in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, which itself seems derived from an older Maithili manuscript in the Rāj Library at Darbhanga. All these have been available to me. The three manuscripts have to be treated as one. The oldest manuscript which I have used is from the library of H. H. the Mahā Rāṇa of Udaipūr in Mewar. It is undated but clearly belongs to the 16th century at the latest. A manuscript of which a copy was secured from the Raghunāth Temple Library at Jammu seems to be also dependent on the group mentioned above, and to be identical with them except for copyists' errors. It bears the late date *Samvat* 1846 (1790 A.D.).

[1] Mr. Kane's conclusion is that the *Kalpataru* "must have been written between 1100 and 1150 A.D., and probably in the 2nd quarter of the 12th century" (*op. cit.*, p. 317).

[2] A. S. Altekar, "The S'ilāhāras of Western India," *Indian Culture*, II, pp. 412—413. "The turning battle in the S'ilāhāra-Kadamba war was fought in A.D. 1126. As a result of this victory Aparārka ceased to be a Kadamba feudatory and regained most of his hereditary possessions."

The first of the two passages occurs in the chapter on Ordeals (*divya*), sub-section *Kos'adivya*, and Slaves (*Dāsyadhikāriṇaḥ*). It runs, in most of the manuscripts, thus:

शोध्यस्य जननी तातः पुत्रो वा तत्सहोदरः ।
भार्या पुत्रवती धर्म्या ज्ञातयः परिकीर्तिताः ॥[1]

इति वादिभयङ्करे बृहस्पतिवचनात् ॥

In *Vīramitrodaya*, Vyavahārakāṇḍa, Vādibhayaṃkara is described as a work by a follower (*anuyāyī*) of Vijñānes'vara, who exposed an apparent inconsistency in his master, in explaining a verse of *Yājñāvalkyasmṛti* (II, 51). The passage runs thus:

विज्ञानेश्वरानुयायी यथात्र वादिभयङ्करकृदाह—
अहो बत जगत्ख्यातविज्ञानेश्वरयोगिनः ।
पूर्वापरविरोधेऽपि नाऽनुसन्धानमद्भुतम् ॥[2]

This passage is wanting in the Udaipur MS., which is the *oldest* used, while it occurs in the rest.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE PASSAGES EXAMINED: FIRST PASSAGE

The concurrence of testimony in four MSS. will create a presumption in favour of the authenticity of this text as part of the original *Kalpataru*, *if* the manuscripts are independent and not transcripts of one original as is the case. We have thus a conflict between two sets of manuscripts, one furnishing the above text and the other omitting it.

Is there any method of checking the genuineness of the citation from Vādibhayaṃkarakṛt? It seems to me that there is. The verse is alleged to be a text of Bṛhaspati, which Lakṣmīdhara took second-hand from the above scholiast, quoting the source of his information. Till now the writer who furnishes this citation from Bṛhaspati is known only from this passage and the other quoted by Mitra Mis'ra in *Vīramitrodaya*. A passage from Bṛhaspati, if authentic, is hardly likely to be missed by

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 290, notes 640 and 641. It appears to me that Vādibhayaṃkara is the name of a work, rather than of an author, as assumed by Mr. Kane.

[2] *Vīramitrodaya*, Vyavahāraprakās'a Ed. Jībānanda 1875, p. 350.

digest-writers and commentators, and especially by writers who take delight in bringing into as many authoritative citations as possible, like Mitra Mis'ra himself. It is remarkable that not only is the Bṛhaspati quotation missing in Mitra Mis'ra's work, at the corresponding place and context, but it is missing in such special studies of *divya* (ordeals) as Raghunandana's *Divya-tattva*. It is even more strange that it is unavailable among the ninety-two verses from Bṛhaspati, which occur in the digests and commentaries on *divya*. The passage, cited on the authority of Vādibhayaṃkarakṛt, is also tautologous, when considered with the following genuine verse of Bṛhaspati, which is cited in many digests to show that the effect of the ordeal should be watched not only on the man subjected to it but on his wife, children and effects :

सप्ताहाद्वा विसप्ताहाद्यस्य हानिर्न जायते ।
पुत्रदारधनानां च स शुद्धस्यान्न संशयः ॥

Alternative readings :

यस्यार्ति र्न प्रजायते and उभयत्राऽपि[1] ।

The alleged quotation seems to add to the number of persons (to be watched for the effect of the test) the parents, brothers and *jñātis*. But, as it mentions the wife and sons, who are already included in the above authentic verse, the tautology would justify the rejection of the alleged text.

In no other case has Lakṣmīdhara cited a source for a quotation from a writer so well known as Bṛhaspati.

If the *s'loka* in question *is* authentic, it might have been brought in for the purpose of elucidating the term *jñāti*, in the following verses of Kātyāyana and Lakṣmīdhara's comment thereon, which precede the citation :

अथ देवविसंवाद त्रिसप्ताहात्तु दापयेत् ।
अभियुक्तं प्रयत्नेन तमर्थं दण्डमेव च ॥
तस्यैकस्य तु सर्वस्य जनस्य यदि तद्भवेत् ।
रोगोऽग्निर्ज्ञातिमरणं ऋणं दद्यात् दमं च सः ॥

[1] See my edition of the reconstructed *Bṛhaspati-smṛti*, 1941, VII, 65.

ज्वरातिसारविस्फोटः शूलादिपरिपीडनम् ।
नेत्ररुग्गलरोगश्च तथोन्मादः प्रजायते ॥
शिरोरुग्गलरोगश्च दैविका व्याधयो नृणाम् ।[1]
' देवविसंवादः ' देवकृतो रोगज्ञातिमरणादिरूपो विरोधः ।

Bṛhaspati's alleged verse will then have to be treated either as a definition of the term *jñāti* or as a restriction of the general sense of the term for the special purpose of limiting the applicability of the test or ordeal only to *some*, as against *all jñātis*. The word '*s'odhyasya*' at the beginning of the *s'loka* shows that it was intended to be part of the general treatment of ordeals, as it refers to the 'person to be tested' (*s'odhya*). If the *s'loka* is intended to convey Bṛhaspati's idea of *jñātivarga* it will show that he took a narrower view of the limits of *jñāti-varga* than other authorities. The *jñāti* circle will then include only a man's parents, sons, brothers, and the caste-wife, who has had male progeny. Others have construed the term more liberally. In the list of persons who are to honour the new bride, Yājñavalkya mentions the bride's husband, her own brothers, her *jñāti-varga*, her father-in-law and mother-in-law, brothers-in-law (*i.e.* brothers of her husband) and *bandhuvargaḥ*.[2] In explaining the verse, Vis'varūpa interprets the word *jñāti* (*jñātis'abda*) as 'maternal uncle and others'' (*mātulādiḥ*).[3] Medhātithi in commenting on the word '*jñātayaḥ*' in *Manusmṛti*,

[1] The passage may be rendered as follows :—

"(The judge) should strictly compel the accused to pay, after three weeks, in case of the befalling of the fateful calamities (on the defendant undergoing the *kos'a* or the *taṇḍula* ordeal), a fine and the subject of the dispute.

If any one of the following befalling him alone and not all people (in the neighbourhood) *viz.* disease, fire, death of a relation (*jñāti*), then he should be made to pay the fine as well as the debt (which is the subject of the dispute).

The diseases brought on by the wrath of Fate are fever, diarrhoea, carbuncles, suffering from rheumatism, diseases of the eye and throat, insanity, headache and fracture of the arms.

"Devavisaṃvādaḥ, means calamities like disease and death of relations caused by Fate."

[2] *Yajñavalkyasmṛti*, I, 82.

भर्तृभ्रातृपितृज्ञातिश्वश्रूश्वशुरदेवरैः ।
बन्धुभिश्च स्त्रियः पूज्याः भूषणाच्छादनाशनैः ॥

[3] Ed. Gaṇapati S'astri, 1922, Trivandram, p. 84 (T. S. S. No. 74).

III, 264 (254 in Jhā's Edn.) distinguishes between *jñāti* and *bandhu* thus :

'ज्ञातयः' सगोत्राः । मातृश्वशुरपक्षः 'बान्धवाः'[1] Kullūka follows the interpretation of Vis'varūpa in interpreting Manu's, injunction[2] that one guilty of *mahāpātaka* (inexpiable sin) should be abandoned even by his relations. He takes '*jñāti*' to mean '*mātulādi*,'' *i.e.*, the maternal uncle and others ; but in explaining the same word in *Manusmṛti* (III, 264), he follows the distinction between *Jñāti* and *bandhu* made by Medhātithi. Buehler in translating the verse[3] has accordingly treated *jñātayaḥ* as equivalent to 'paternal relations' and '*bāndhavāḥ*' as signifying 'maternal relations,' a distinction which he repeats in translating *jñāti* and *sambandhi* in *Manusmṛti*, IX, 239. Mitra Mis'ra[4] in interpreting the verse in *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* on the perpetual tutelge of women, construes '*jñātyaha*' as '*sapiṇḍāḥ*.' The *S'abdakalpadruma* gives an elaborate reckoning of *jñātivarga* :

सप्तमपुरुषपर्यन्तं सपिण्डः । ततः त्रिपुरुषपर्यन्तं सकुल्यः । ततः चतुर्थपर्यन्तं समानोदकः । ततः परं गोत्रजाः[5] ॥

It will be seen that there has been wide disagreement among authorities on the signification of the term *jñāti*. It is incredible that an authoritative definition of it by a jurist of the eminence

[1] Ed. Gangānāth Jhā, *Bibliotheca Indica*, Vol. I, 1932, p. 319.

The s'loka of *Manusmṛti* (III, 264, in the ordinary editions and III, 254 in Jhā's Ed. of Medhātithi) runs as under :

प्रक्षाल्य हस्तावाचम्य ज्ञातिप्रायं प्रकल्पयेत् ।
ज्ञातिभ्यः सत्कृतं दत्वा बान्धवानपि भोजयेत् ॥

[2] *Manusmṛti*, IX, 239 ·

ज्ञातिसम्बन्धिभिस्त्वेते त्यक्तव्या कृतलक्षणैः ।

[3] S.B.E., XXV, 1886, p. 384.

[4] *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* :

रक्षेत्कन्यां पिता विन्नां पतिः पुत्रश्च वार्द्धके ।
अभावे ज्ञातयस्तेषां न स्वातन्त्र्यं क्वचित् स्त्रियः ॥

The comment of Mitra Mis'ra is :

एवं रक्षणसमर्थानां पित्रादिपुत्रान्तानां असत्वे तदतिरिक्ताः सपिण्डाः रक्षेयुः, एव स्वदोषपरिहारार्थम् ॥

(Chowkhamba Edn. of *Yajñavalkyasmṛti* with the commentary *Viramitrodaya*, p. 150.)

[5] Ed. Vasu, 1878.

of Bṛhaspati should not have attracted the attention of commentators and *nibandhakāras*, and that it should be left to be gathered even by Lakṣmīdhara from an obscure writer like Vādibhayaṃkarakṛt. If the verse attributed to Bṛhaspati is, on the other hand, a limiting clause attached to that of Kātyāyana and other writers about the kinsmen who should be watched for the effects of the ordeal, it is no less strange that so important a restricting clause should *not* have found its way in other later or earlier writers who treated of ordeals. The circumstances in regard to this quotation are so suspicious that its ascription to Bṛhaspati *solely* on this passage referring to Vādibhayaṃkarakṛt, which might have been interpolated into the text by a reader of Lakṣmīdhara's digest, is not justified, and I have had to reject it in my reconstruction of *Bṛhaspatismṛti*, in the Baroda Oriental Series.

SECOND PASSAGE

We may now consider the second ground of the view of Mr. Kane that Lakṣmīdhara quotes Vijñāneśvara. The Sarasvatibhavan transcript of *Vyavahāra-Kalpataru* reads—

क्षत्रधर्मस्तु ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणं दासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति **विज्ञानेश्वर** स्वरस: ।

This sentence occurs almost at the end of a short paragraph in which Lakṣmīdhara discusses the effect of the injunctions of Nārada and Kātyāyana on the circumstances in which members of the four castes can become slaves (*dāsāḥ*). The paragraph is defective in the Udaipūr manuscript and hardly makes any meaning; and it contains neither the name of Vijñāneśvara nor of the *Pārijāta* and of Halāyudha which occur in other manuscripts. A manuscript of the work, which belonged to the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Baccha Jhā of Dharbhanga gives a condensed version of the passage:

'तदूनमिति'— शीलाध्ययनसम्पन्नं ब्राह्मणं, शीलाध्ययनसम्पन्नो ब्राह्मण: कर्मकारयेदिति योजना । 'अशुभं' विण्मूत्रशोधनादि । 'क्षत्रविट्शूद्रधर्म' इत्यादि—क्षत्रियादिधर्मो ब्राह्मण: दासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति **बृहस्पतिमतं** इत्यर्थ: ॥

A manuscript in the Dharbhanga Palace Library contains only the above short passage with the following changes:

(*a*) It adds: कामतः तदिच्छया after योजना.

(*b*) It interpolates ब्राह्मणम् between ब्राह्मणः and दासकर्मणि.

This manuscript was copied for me through the Baroda Oriental Institute and bear its Stock Number 13929. Another manuscript from the Dharbhanga Palace, which was also copied for me (and which bears the Baroda No. 13928) gives the longer version, which occurs also in a transcript from Jammu, and which is virtually identical with the transcript in Sarasvatibhavan used by Mr. Kane, and its source, *viz.*, the MS. in the Asiatic Society at Calcutta.

The longer passage, as edited from these manuscripts, runs as follows:

शीलाध्ययनसम्पन्नो ब्राह्मणः, 'कामतः' इच्छन्तं, 'तदूनं' शीलाध्यनान्यूनं, कर्मकारयेदिति योजना। तत्रापि 'न अशुभं,' विण्मूत्रशोधनादिकं, न कारयेदित्यर्थः। 'क्षत्रविट् शूद्रधर्मस्तु' इत्यादि। क्षत्रवैश्यशूद्राणां तु सगुणानां अपि सावर्ण्ये अपि कदाचिद्दासस्वामिभावो भवेत्। ब्राह्मणस्तु 'समवर्णं' समानगुणं दासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति बृहस्पति र्मन्यते इत्यर्थः। इति **पारिजात-हलायुधस्वरसः**। क्षत्रविट्शूद्रधर्मस्तु ब्राह्मणः ब्राह्मणदासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति विज्ञानेश्वर स्वरसः। सर्वाश्चायं अर्थः उपग्राह्य एव ॥

On an analysis of the manuscripts, it is seen that the references to *Pārijāta*, Halāyudha and Vijñānes'vara are found in three manuscripts, *viz.*, at Calcutta, Dharbhanga and Jammu, and a transcript of the Calcutta manuscript at Benares; and in three independent manuscripts, namely those at Udaipūr, Dharbhanga Palace and Navani in Dharbhanga (belonging to Baccha Jhā) the references are entirely absent.

In considering the authenticity of the references in this passage, it would be helpful to examine the reproduction (without the omission of even a word) of the whole of this section of the *Kalpataru* by Caṇḍes'vara in the *Dāsyādhikāravidhiḥ* chapter of his *Vivādaratnākara*[1]. In this reproduction, the prose explanations which are missing in the group of three

[1] Ed. *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1887, pp. 152—155

manuscripts, that give the shorter version of the comment reproduced above, are found as in the Asiatic Society's manuscript and those derived from it.

Caṇḍesvara gives the crucial passage thus :

ब्राह्मणस्तु सवर्णं समवर्णं समानगुणं न कारयेदिति बृहस्पतिः मन्यते इति पारिजात हलायुध स्वरसः । क्षत्रविट्शूद्रधर्मस्तु ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणं दासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति **लक्ष्मीधरस्वरसः** । सर्वैश्च अयं अर्थः उपग्राह्य एवेति ॥[1]

It should be noted that the view attributed to Vijñānesvara as his personal opinion (*svarasaḥ*) is here ascribed by Caṇḍesvara not to Vijñānesvara but to Lakṣmīdhara himself.

It is not open to contend that Caṇḍesvara committed an error in giving the opinion as Lakṣmīdhara's ; for, what is stated *is* the view of Lakṣmīdhara, as gatherable from the entire section, while it is *opposed* to the opinion of Vijñānesvara, as given in the *Mitākṣarā*.

The point will be clear if the tenor of the discussion is briefly stated. Of the several modes in which servitude may arise there are two, *viz*., by a person surrendering *voluntarily* his liberty, even as a woman does when she marries, or forfeiting it by doing something which is heinous. There is further the general rule, which is stated in several smṛtis, that a Brāhmaṇa cannot be made a slave. Thus Kātyāyana[2] lays down :

त्रिषु वर्णेषु विज्ञेयं दास्यं विप्रस्य न क्वचित् ।

The *pūrvārdha* refers to the assumption of slavery voluntarily, like a wife, by giving away one's liberty (svatantra-syātmano dānāddāsatavam dāravat matam).

Kātyāyana also says :

ब्राह्मणस्य हि दासत्वात् नृपतेजो विहन्यते ।

(By the slavery of a Brahman the lustre of the King is lost.)[3]

[1] Ed. *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1887, p. 153.

[2] Kane, *Katyayanasmṛtisāroddhāra*, 1933, verse 715.

[3] *ibid*., verse 717.

A person who renounces the ascetic life (*pravrajy-'āvasitaḥ*) becomes, according to Yājñavalkya the life-long slave of the King.[1] The same rule is given by Nārada in specifying the person whose slave a person abandoning the ascetic order becomes :

राज्ञो हि दासस्स्यात् प्रव्रज्यावसितो नरः ।

' He becomes the slave of the King. He cannot be emancipated (*na tasya mokṣosti*) being a slave for life '.[2]

The rule implies that a Brāhmaṇa *can* be the slave of a king, who will normally belong the *kṣatriya* caste and who *can* be of even a lower caste. If such a degradation of status of a Brāhmaṇa occurs, it would be opposed to another rule of law that the relation of master and slave can exist only between those of equal caste (*varṇa*) or in the order of the castes (*anulomataḥ*), the master being of the higher and the slave of the lower caste. The reverse order is prohibited :

वर्णानामानुलोम्येन दास्यं न प्रतिलोमतः[3] ।

The prohibition of *pratiloma* in the relation of master and slave is repeated by Nārada, who states in the *only* exceptions to the rule that those who abandom their *āśrama-dharma* (the persons who renounce asceticism for example) *can* have a *pratiloma* relationship :

वर्णानां प्रातिलोम्येन दासत्वं न विधीयते ।
स्वधर्मत्यागिनोऽन्यत्र[4]

Vijñāneśvara in commenting on the passage in Yājñavalkya prohibiting *pratiloma* relationship between slave and master cites the above rule of Nārada to show that a *pratiloma* relation *can* exist between master and slave, as when a king becomes the

[1] *See* II, 183 :

प्रव्रज्यावसितो राज्ञो दास आमरणान्तिकम् ।

[2] Ed. Jolly, *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1886, p. 148 :

राज्ञां एव तु दासस्यात् प्रव्रज्यावसितो नरः ।
न तस्य विप्रमोक्षोऽस्ति न विशुद्धिः कदाचन ॥

[3] *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, II, 189.

[4] *Nāradasmṛti*, V, 39.

owner of a slave, who had forfeited his liberty by abandoning his *dharma* as an ascetic :[1]

स्वधर्मत्यागिनः पुनः परिव्राजकस्य प्रातिलोम्येन दासत्वमिष्यत एव ।

Accordingly, Vijñānes'vara's view is that a Brāhmaṇa ascetic, who renounces his *Sanyāsa*, becomes for life the slave of one inferior to him in caste. But, the passage in the *Kalpataru*, which is brought up as containing a reference to Vijñānes'vara's view, definitely ascribes to him, as his characteristic opinion (*svarasaḥ*), the conclusion that the rule for Kṣatriyas, Vais'yas and S'ūdras is that they *cannot* put a Brāhmaṇa in the position of a slave to do a slave's work.[2]

CONCLUSION

If Lakṣmīdhara desired to refer to a writer, he would obviously not have done so by attributing to him the exact *opposite* of the views to which he had given public expression, in a book which must be available to every one. This is just what he must be deemed to have done, if we accept the view that the passage cited above is authentic and contains Lakṣmīdhara's citation of Vijñānes'vara's opinion on the controverted point. The view embodied in the passage is that of Lakṣmīdhara and not that of Vijñānes'vara. Caṇḍes'vara was therefore right in citing the conclusion embodied in the above *vyavasthā* (opinion) as Lakṣmīdhara's. Its attribution to Vijñānes'vara only shows that he who made it had not read the *Mitākṣarā* ! It may be noted (as a justification for Caṇḍes'vara's citing the passage as Lakṣmīdhara's special view) that, in the selection of authorities from *smṛti* to decide the question—whether under any or particular circumstances a member of the first caste (*prathama-varṇa*) can be enslaved—Lakṣmīdhara deliberately refrained from citing *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* and coupling it, as done by the *Mitākṣarā*, with the amplification by *Nāradasmṛti*, and that authorities are brought in to support his thesis that under *no* circumstances can a Brāhmaṇa be brought down to a servile

[1] Comment on Yajñāvalkya, II, 183.

[2] क्षत्रविट्शूद्रधर्मस्तु ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणं दासकर्मणि न कारयेदिति विज्ञानेश्वरस्वरसः ॥
(*Vyavahāra-Kalpataru*, Folio 380 of Sarasvatibhavan Transcript).

status. His view is in harmony with that of *Viṣṇusmṛti*[1] which imposes the highest amercement for violence (*uttama-sāhasa-daṇḍa*) for the offence of reducing to servitude a Brāhmaṇa and also with that of Kātyāyana and Bṛhaspati.

It is thus clear that the reference to Vijñānes'vara in the *Kalpataru* is *not* authentic. Both this sentence and the one bringing in an alleged quotation from Bṛhaspati are manifestly the interpolations of some reader, who noted them in his copy of the *Kalpataru*, and when the manuscript was again copied, the scribe, as scribes still do, embodied the marginal note of the reader in the text, as if it was part and parcel of the text.[2]

LAKṢMĪDHARA'S CITING VIJÑĀNES'VARA OTHERWISE IMPROBABLE ALSO

Even apart from the drift of this line of evidence, the balance of probabilities is against Lakṣmīdhara making any open allusion to Vijñānes'vara, even if it be conceded that, owing to the assumed chronological relationship between the two writers, such a reference was possible. The position of the two writers precludes such acknowledgment. Lakṣmīdhara was, for instance, the chief minister of the powerful king of Kānauj, who was extending his dominions and adding to them, so as to come within striking distance of the dominions of the Cālukya ruler, Vikramāditya VI, whom Vijñānes'varā glorifies.[3] The fourth

[1] *Viṣṇusmṛti*, V, 151 Ed. Jolly :—यस्तूत्तमवर्णान् दास्ये नियोजयेत् तस्योत्तमसाहसो दण्डः ।

[2] This is technically known as 'reader's conflation.' *Conflation* is the appearance in a manuscript of readings which are neither derived from the archetype (by continuous descent), nor are original variants of its own or of any of its ancestors, but have been imported. The type of interpolation now noticed in the *Kalpataru* will be termed also as "contamination" by some critics. (W. W. Greg, *The Calculus of Variants*, Oxford, 1927, p. 56).

[3] A copper-plate grant dated Vikrama-samvat, 1177 (*i.e.* A. D., 1120) now in the possession of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, mentions that Govindacandra sanctioned the transfer of the village of Karaṇḍa and the *talla* of Karaṇḍa in the *paṭṭalā* of Antarāla, which was originally granted by Yasaḥkarṇa, from the possession of Bhaṭṭāraka Rudras'iva, a royal chaplain, into that of the Thakkura Vasiṣṭha. Yasaḥkarṇa is obviously the Cedi ruler who was the son and successor of the more famous conqueror Karṇa of the Kalacūri dynasty, whose reign must have come to an end before A. D. 1080 as in the Candrāvati copper-plate of King Candradeva of Kanauj it is stated thus: "When Bhoja went to Heaven, and when Karṇa remained only in renown, and when the earth was being troubled, she found a refuge and a protection in Candradeva Gāhadvāla" (*Ind. Ant.*, XIV, p. 103). From A. D. 1117 the title "as'vapati-gajapati-narapati-rājyatrayādhipati" appears in the grants of Govindacandra of Kanauj, (*Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, pp. 19—20) and is

and sixth verses in the conclusion of the *Mitākṣarā*, which are indubitably by Vijñānes'vara himself, makes these claims: "There is and there will never be on the earth, a city equal to Kalyāṇa (Vikramāditya's capital). No king who could be compared to Vikramārka has ever been seen or head of. The learned Vijñānes'vara cannot submit to be compared to the slightest extent with a rival. May these three, who are comparable to the *Kalpavṛkṣa* (the immortal wish-yielding tree), last (live) till the end of the present cycle of time (*kalpa*). . . . From the causeway of the ornament of the race of Raghu, which is massed fame (*i.e.*, "Rāma's Bridge") to the monarch of the mountains (*i.e.*, the Himālayas), and from the western ocean, whose waves are raised by the gambols of shoals of fishes, to the eastern ocean (*i.e.*, from the Indian Ocean to the Bay of Bengal), may Vikramādityadeva, whose feet are resplendent from the lustre of the gems on the diadems of prostrating kings, protect the entire world so long as the Moon and the Stars endure."[1]

IMPLICATIONS OF VIJÑANES'VARA'S PANEGYRIC

The panegyric is as usual couched in somewhat exaggerated terms, but the skill of the author is shown in bringing into it innuendoes and references to facts or claims which a contemporary would readily detect. Thus, the words referring to the western ocean, as one of the limits of Vikramāditya's dominion, contain a concealed reference to his great contemporary and enemy, *Kulottuṅga Cola*, which has not till now caught the attention of scholars. The words "caṭulatimi-*Kulottungaringattaraṅgāt*"

continued in the descriptions of his successors. Later on the same title is taken by the Cedt ruler Narasimhavarman (c. 1155 A. D.). It has been suggested that the rulers of the Andhra country were the Narapatis. (C. V. Vaidya, *History of Medieval Indıa*, II, 192?, p. 191).

[1] नासीदस्ति भविष्यति क्षितितले कल्याणकल्पं पुरं
नो दृष्टः श्रुत एव क्षितिपतिः श्रीविक्रमार्कोपमः ।
विज्ञानेश्वरपण्डितो न भजते किं चान्यदन्योपम-
श्चाकल्पं स्थिरमस्तु कल्पलतिकाकल्पं तदेतत्त्रयम् ॥
आसेतोः कीर्तिराशेः रघुकुलतिलकस्या च शैलाधिराजात्
आ च प्रत्यक् पयोधेः चटुलतिमिकुलोत्तुङ्गरिङ्गत्तरङ्गात् ।
आ च प्राचीसमुद्रान्नतनृपतिशिरोरत्नभाभासुराङ्घ्रिः
पायादाचन्द्रतारं जगदिदमखिलं विक्रमादित्यदेवः ॥

which qualify in the more obvious sense 'the western ocean with waves raised by the gambols of shoals of giant fishes,' may be taken as qualifying 'the eastern ocean' in the concealed sense of "the unsteady movements of the struggling whale, of a *Kulottunga*." The spiteful statement may have been put in for the special delectation of Vikramāditya, even as even more spiteful allusions to Kulottunga, under a corrupt form of his earlier title, Rājendra,[1] (Rājiga) occur frequently in the poem (*Vikramāṅkadevacarita*) in which Bilhaṇa lauded the life and achievements of Vikramāditya VI. Bilhaṇa refers to Kulottunga specifically as "the family foe" of Vikramāditya. The careers of the two kings should have, by their remarkable parallelism, intensified the bitterness of their rivalry. Both came to their imperial heritage by what Bilhaṇa calls "the concurrence of fortune," at almost the threshold of middle age. Both ruled for half-a-century. The Vengi country, forming the area between the mouths or deltas of the Kṛṣṇā and Godavarī rivers, was one of the bones of contention. The tract was originally a part of the Cālukya empire in the seventh century, and became independent under a younger branch of the original Cālukya line (the "Eastern" Cālukyas). Vikramāditya belonged to the later Cālukya line, whose kinship with the older line was hypothetical, while Kulottunga was by descent a scion of both the older Cālukya line (through the Eastern Cālukyas of Vengi) and of the Colas. Before he became the Cola emperor in 1070, he had fought, in A. D. 1067, Vikramāditya, who was then the favourite of his father Somes'vara I, the founder of Kalyāṇa, and obtained from his admirers the title *Virudarāja-bhayaṃkara*, 'the terror of Virudarāja or Vikramāditya'.[2] The Cālukya had almost recovered Vengi, when the news of his father's death and the accession of his elder brother and enemy, Somes'vara II made

[1] Canto VI, s'lokas 26 and 27 :

अथ कतिषुचिदेव दैवयोगात् परिगलितेषु दिनेषु चोलसूनोः ।
श्रियमहरत राजिगाभिधानः प्रकृतिविरोधहतस्य चेङ्गिनाथः ॥
कुटिलमतिरसासौ विशङ्कमानः पुनरमुमेव पराभवप्रगल्भम् ।
प्रगुणमपकृतपृष्टकोपहेतोः प्रकृतिविरोधिनमस्य सोमदेवम् ॥

[2] *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi*, X, 25, referring to the war of 1067 states that it was in this war that Kulottunga earned the title of 'Terror to Virudurāja or Vikramāditya' (*Virudurāja-bhayaṃkara*). *See* Nilakaṇṭha S'āstri, *Colas*, II, 1937, p. 5.

him withdraw (A. D. 1069). Vikramāditya had married a Cola princess, the daughter of the emperor Vīrarājendra I, and so had a shadowy claim to the Cola heritage. Six years after the accession of Kulottunga to the Cola throne war broke out again between him and Vikramāditya, who was to seize the Cālukya throne (A. D. 1076) on the defeat of his brother by Kulottunga, who had meanwhile turned the tables on his rival, conquered Konkan and the Mysore country, and reached the western sea. Kulottunga was however unable to push his advantages far, owing to the revolt of Ceylon and the invasion of Vengi by Yas'aḥ-Karṇadeva, the Haihaya king.[1] By A. D. 1076 Kulottunga had reconquered Vengi and appointed a son as viceroy over the tract.[2] He began his campaigns against Kaliṅga, on the northern frontier of Vengi, in A. D 1096 and a more famous invasion of Kaliṅga in A. D. 1110, which his general Karuṇākara over-ran.[3] *In A. D. 1115 his dominions reached their maximum extension,* and virtually embraced the entire area of the present Madras Presidency.[4] By 1116 A. D. the tide turned against Kulottunga. The Mysore territory was lost by that year.[5] By 1118 Vikramāditya had reconquered almost the whole of Vengi,[6] and his territory had then *really* extended from the Western to the Eastern ocean, as stated in the panegyric of Vijñānes'vara, quoted above. The diplomatic activity of Vikramāditya was aimed at embarrassing his rival, by instigating enemies and rebellious feudatories. The Pāṇḍya revolt, the Ceylon rebellion and the troubles in Vengi and Kaliṅga, as well as in the Kannaḍa country, were all fomented by him.[7] The wish that Vikramāditya should continue to rule from Rameswaram to the Himālayas, expressed in Vijñānes'vara's panegyrical verse, should be construed as a reflection of these alliances and the extension of the sphere of his influence to the dominions of the Cola emperor. If the description of Vikramāditya's sovereignty

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 8—14.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 33—38
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 38—39
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 41—44.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 44 to 47. "That Vikramāditya's rule did extend in this period to the whole of the Telugu country becomes clear from the provenance of his inscriptions."
[7] *Ibid.*, Ch. XIII (pp. 1—60) *passim*.

as extending from ocean to ocean, and from Rama's Bridge, is realistic and not an empty vaunt it can only refer to a period *after* 1118 towards the end of the reign of Vikramāditya, who died in A.D. 1127. The prayer for stability *(ākalpam sthiram astu)* which Vijñānes'vara has uttered must have reference to the varying fortunes of the conquered areas, just as the reference to the struggles of "the whale Kulottunga" is an allusion to his last war against his rival.

DATE OF THE MITĀKṢARĀ

Considered in this way, the date of the *Mitākṣarā* must be about A. D. 1120, *i.e.*, twenty years later than the *latest* limit assigned by Mr. Kane to its composition and fifty years later than his upper limit for Vijñānes'vara.[1] A considerable part of the Digest of Lakṣmidhara must, on the date given below, have been composed *before* this date. That is to say, the Digest should have been written *early* in the reign of Govindacandra, while the commentary (*i.e.*, the *Mitākṣarā)* should have been composed towards the end of the long reign of Vikramāditya. This is borne out by the tenor of Vijñānes'vara's panegyric which seems to refer to what has been accomplished rather than to glories to come.[2]

GOVINDACANDRA'S VICTORIES

To turn to the wish that that the Cālukya king should rule *from the Himālayas* to Rameswaram, we must treat it as a pious aspiration if we remember the rapid expansion of the power and dominions of the Gāhadvāla dynasty of Kānauj in spite of the ever present fear of Musalman invasion and conquest.[3] In the Rāhan plate of A. D. 1106, the Yuvarāja Govindacandra records

[1] "The *Mitākṣarā* was composed between 1070—1100 A. D." (*History of Dharmas'ātra*, Vol. I, p. 290.)

[2] The panegyric begins with the words "there never was, is or never will be" (nāsidasti bhaviṣyati kṣititale).

[3] The fear of the Muhammadan was responsible for the permanent addition of a new tax, named *Turukṣa daṇḍa*, a Turk-geld, to the financial imposts of the Kānauj kingdom. It makes its appearance among extant epigraphs in the Rāhan copper-plate grant of Madanapāla and Govindacandra, dated A. D. 1109, and continues to the end of the reign of Jayacandra, who was conquered and killed by the Muhammadans in A. D. 1194.

that he had "*again and again* by the play of his matchless valour" compelled the Amir (*Hammīra*) "to lay aside his enmity." हम्मीरं न्यस्तवैरं मुहुरसमरण-क्रीडया यो विधत्ते.[1] Before 1126 he had annexed parts of Magadha.[2] In 1120 he had changed a gift of a village by the Cedi king Yasaḥkarṇa,[3] and a prince of the line claims in A. D. 1114 to have been honoured for his valour by the king of Kānauj. Govindacandra's victory in Dasārṇa on the day of the birth of his grandson Jayacandra is said to have been the reason for giving his name to the latter.[4] The Gāgaha plate (now in the British Museum) of A. D. 1142 describes Govindacandra as having captured the elephants of "nine Kings."[5]

He had apparently no powerful rival in North India, and the only rulers whose power could match his were Kulottunga, whose armies marched to the limits of North Kaliṅga, and Vikramāditya VI. His relations with these two kings seem to have been dictated by the Hindu political principle that a neighbour, whose frontiers march with one's own, is an enemy (*ari*), actual or potential, while the neighbour's neighbour on the opposed side is his ally (*mitra*), actual or potential, while that ruler's neighbour on the other side is the potential ally of his enemy (*aremitra*).[6] Thus, to Govindacandra, the 'enemy' will be Vikramāditya, and 'ally' Kullottunga, while to Vikramāditya, the natural allies will be those opposed to Kulottunga, like Vijayabāhu, the king of Ceylon, who reconquered Pollannāru (A.D. 1076) and freed Ceylon from Cola rule,[7] the kings

[1] For the Rahan plate *see Ind. Ant.* XVII, pp. 14—19. It is reprinted fully in Vaidya's *History of Mediaeval India*, II, pp. 479–480.

[2] The Maner copper-plate inscription of A. D. 1126 records the grant of a village near Patna by Govindacandra

It is published in the *Journal* of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, II (1916), pp. 441—447.

[3] *See ante*, p. 214 and *J. A. S. B.*, XXXI, p. 124.

[4] *See* the Ratnapur inscription of Jājalladeva dated in the Cedi year 866 or 1114 A. D. It declares that Jajalladeva, who was descended from an earlier king of the same line as the famous Cedi rulers Gāṅgeyadeva, Karṇa and Yasaḥkarṇa, "on account of his prowess was like a friend honoured with fortune" by the king of Kānyakubja, *i.e.* Govindacandra who was then reigning.

[5] For the Gagaha plate *see Epigraphia Indica* XIII, pp. 216—220 and *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, pp. 20—21. The victory over the "nine kings" is mentioned in earlier epigraphs of the king, and the earliest extant reference A. D. is in the Pali plate of 114. (*J. B. O. R. S.*, 1930, pp. 233-238. It clearly reads *Nava-rajya* instead of *Nava-raja*, which alters the meaning completely.)

[6] *See Sarga* VIII of Kāmandāka's *Nitisara*, *slokas* 16 to 50) pp. 105 to 114 of the Trivandrum Edn. 1912).

[7] Nilakaṇṭha S'āstri, *Colas*, II, p. 17.

of the Hoysala dynasty[1] and the kings of Kaliṅga.[2] The influence of the principle on the relations of the three great contemporaries is evidenced by history. Vijayabāhu of Ceylon is said to have married Līlāvati, the daughter of 'Jagatīpāla' of Kānauj. The queen of Jagatīpāla is said to have been an internee in the Cola kingdom, from which she escaped with her daughter to Ceylon. We do not know when this marriage took place, but it must have been in the reign of Vijayabāhu, which extended from c. A.D. 1060 to 1120 practically covering the reigns of Kulottunga and Vikramāditya, and probably after he had freed Ceylon from the Cola supremacy.[3] The dynastic lists of Kānauj, either of the Pratīhāra dynasty or of the Rāṣtrakūṭa branch, which apparently had possession of Kānauj till c. 1085, when it was seized by Candradeva of the Gāhadvāla dynasty, the grandfather of Govindacandra, do not contain the name Jagatīpāla. He was probably an obscure person with pretensions to Pratīthāra or Rāṣtrakūṭa lineage. The flight of the distressed 'queen of Kānauj' with her daughter must have been after Candradeva's conquest and after she had lost all hope.[4]

Why did the fugitives escape from the kingdom of Kulottunga in which they were seeking an asylum ? The answer is suggested by the intimate and friendly relations between Govindacandra and Kulottunga of which evidence exists in a stone epigraph (incomplete or mutilated in some rebuilding operation) of the sovereign of Kānauj, bearing a Cola date corresponding to A.D. 1110, which exists on the walls of a temple in the Cola capital Gangaikoṇḍacolapuram.[5] This inscription gives the familiar Gāhadvāla *praśasti*, and ends (before mutilation commences) with the name of Candradeva, the grandfather of Govindacandra, to whose reign the inscription clearly belongs. The late Mr. V. Venkayya suggested that the inscription was perhaps incised during a friendly visit of the Kānauj king to Kulottunga. This is very unlikely. It is more probable that the endowment recorded in this inscription was intended as a gesture

[1] Nilakantha Śāstri, *Colas*, II, pp. 41—44.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 34—38.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[4] Tripāṭhi, *History of Kanauj*, 1937, pp. 288—290.

[5] Para 56 of the Annual Report of the Madras Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy, for 1907—1908.

of friendship, and was allowed, with the *pras'asti* of a reigning *foreign* ruler to be put up in the very capital of the Cola emperor. It is natural that this alliance between Kulottunga and Govindacandra should shut the Cola dominions to any pretender to the lordship of Kānauj. It will account for the flight of the mother of Līlāvatī to Lankā, and Līlāvatī's own marriage to the king of Lankā who had driven the Colas out of the island. The intense ill-will between Vikramāditya and Kulottunga is evidenced both by contemporary literature (*e. g.*, *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* and the colophon to the *Mitākṣarā*,) and inscription.[1] Govindacandra's diplomatic activities naturally extended to all possible enemies of Vikramāditya VI. Thus, he is said in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* to have received an envoy from the Cālukya ruler of Aṇhilvād (Gujarat), the warlike Siddharāja Jayasimha (A.D. 1093 to 1143) the predecessor of the more famous Kumārapāla (A.D. 1143-1172).[2]

In an Indian kingdom the responsibility for making alliances rests with the *Mahāsāndhivigrahika* or Chief Minister for War and Peace.[3] This was the office held in the kingdom of Kānauj, by both Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara and by his father Bhaṭṭa Hṛdayadhara and is signified by the term *Mantrī*, which occurs at the head, of an enumeration of the officers of state to whom the Kamauli grants of Govindacandra were addressed for execution. In the eighth s'loka introducing his work, Lakṣmīdhara describes himself

[1] *See* Inscription No. 401 of 1896, Madras Epigraphist's Collection, where 'Vikkalan,' *i.e.* Vikramāditya VI and Singaṇan, *i.e.* the Kadamba King Jayasimha, the ally of Vikramāditya, are said to have plunged into the 'western sea' on their route in battle by Kulottunga c. A.D. 1076.

[2] The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. Ed., Jinavijayamuni, III, 121, states that Siddharāja Jayasimha sent an envoy to the king of Kās'i.

[3] The pompous title does not appear in the Gāhadvāla inscriptions, where the *Mantri* is mentioned, immediately after the queen and yuvarāja, among those commanded to give effect to the grantee's wishes. The title of *Mahāsāndhivigrahika* describes an important duty of the Chief Minister (*Mantri*). It occurs in Raṣṭrakuṭa records, where the functionary is usually entrusted with the duty of drawing up the copper-plate grants recording gifts or alienations. This duty is assigned to this officer in an anonymous text quoted in the *Mitakṣarā*, on Yājnavalkya, I, 319--320 :

"The drafter (of the copper-plate) should be the *Sandhivigrahikakāri*. He should draft the charter as dictated by the king himself."

Apparently the responsibility for accurately expressing the king's commands could not be entrusted to any lower person than the Chief Minister, responsible for the policy of the kigdom. The philosophical reflections on the transitoriness of life and the enduring nature of charity, which occur in some of the Gāhadvāla inscriptions, must be deemed to represent the very words of the donors (*e.g.* Candradeva's Candravati plate of 1093, and Madanapāla-Govindacandra plate of 1099). *See* A. S. Altekar, *Raṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, 1934, p. 166.

as "*Mantrīs'varaḥ.*" This should be treated as a *paryāya* for the official title of *Mahāsāndhivigrahika*, which appears over and over again in the colophons. In two places, *viz.*, at the beginning of the first *kāṇḍa* and at the beginning of the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, Lakṣmīdhara proclaims that it was *solely* through *his* counsel that king Govindacandra attained supremacy over other kings, trod the path of righteousness, and made many crowned heads humble themselves at the feet of this king. Such an open declaration in a work written by command of a powerful ruler could not have been made unless the truth underlying it was well-known. The Cola alliance, of which we have evidence, soon after the formal assumption of sovereignty of Govindacandra about A. D. 1110 may have been due to his Minister's skill, and intended to check the designs of the aged and warlike ruler of the Dakhan. It is noteworthy that in the description of the prowess of his king, in the introductory stanza, Lakṣmīdhara refers only to two exploits specifically, *viz.*, repeated defeats of the *Hammīra*, *i.e.*, the Muhammadan invader, and the humbling of the Gauḍa ruler. The first exploit occurred only during the reign of Madanapāla, when as Yuvarāja Govindacandra was virtual ruler.

The second exploit, *i.e.*, the humbling the Gauḍa, must refer to some attack, of which we have found no record as yet that occurred early in the reign, on Madanapāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal, who had sought the alliance of Candradeva, Govindacandra's grandfather, when attacked the Sena king Vijayasena. It cannot refer to the later conquest of Pāla territory as far as Monghyr, since in the Rāhan plate of A.D. 1109 Govindacandra is already described as "terrific in cleaving the frontal lobes of arrays of irresistible mighty elephants from Gauḍa." The same inscription records that he "again and again by the play of his matchless fighting compelled the Hammīra to lay aside his enmity," in language recalling Lakṣmīdhara's *pras'astī* of Govindacandra :

असम-समर-सम्यक्-लम्पटश्शौर्यभाजं अवधिरवधियुद्धे येन हम्मीरवीरः ॥

The omission to refer to the later conquests in Das'ārṇa and Magadha and to the victory over the 'nine kings' (*nava-rāja*) and to Govindacandra's later title—*as'vapati*, *gajapati*, *narapati*,

rājyatrayādhipati vividha-vidyā-vicāra-vācaspati (these could not be missed by a Minister who composes an eulogy on his Sovereign)—makes it clear that his vague references, other than these two specific claims adduced on his behalf to Govindacandra's military exploits, must have been due to Lakṣmīdhara having written early in the reign before those conquests were made and new *virudas* acquired.[1] There is no violence to probability in such a view, because Govindacandra had been virtual ruler for a dozen years before his formal accession, and even as Yuvarāja must have attained manhood.[2] As Lakṣmīdhara's father was also a Minister before him, it is not unlikely that father and son served Govindacandra's father and Govindacandra himself, and that they had been commissioned for the composition of the *Kalpataru* even before the formal beginning for the reign of Govidacandra, who is pointedly praised by Lakṣmīdhara for his self-mastery, and learning.[3] The inscriptions show that Govindacandra's predecessors were devoted to Hinduism.[4]

[1] The *viruda* "as'vapati-gajapati-narapati rājyatryādhipati vividha-vidyā-vicāra-vācaspatiḥ" appears first, in the extant inscriptions, in a grant dated A.D. 1117 (*Ind. Ant.* XVII, pp. 19—20), and the reference to the exploit of capturing the elephants of nine kings first appears in an inscription of A.D. 1114 (the copper-plate, Pali, *J. B. O. R. S.*, 1930, pp. 233-238) but it has been translated as referring to the new kingdom (*Navarājya-gaja*) personified as an elephant, instead of being taken as referring to the elephants of nine kings (*Navarajagajo narendraḥ*), The full sentence is :

तस्मादजायत निजायतवाहुवल्ली
बद्धावरुद्धनवराज(ज्य)गजो नरेन्द्रः ।
सान्द्रामताद्रवमुचां प्रभवो गवां यो
गोविन्दचन्द्र इति चन्द्र इवांबुराशेः ॥

As this *s'loka* is repeated in subsequent grants, as an official *pras'asti*, and as when it first appears Govindacandra must have been ruler for atleast ten years, the description of him (under this verse) of having by his powerful arms bound and controlled the elephant (which was) the *new* kingdom, is pointless.

[2] Grants of A. D. 1114 refer to the Yuvarāja among those asked to implement them. A Yuvarāja must be atleast sixteen years of age. As Govindacandra was Yuvarāja as early as atleast 1099 when in a grant issued by him in the life-time of his father, he omits to mention the Yuvarāja (*i.e.*, himself) among those commanded to give effect to the grant, he should have been at least thirty years of age in 1110. His latest extant inscription is dated A. D. 1154, when on this supposition he must have been seventy-four, not an improbable age considering what his contemporaries Vikramāditya, Kulottunga and others attained.

[3] It is expressly stated in some of the colophons to the *Kalpataru* that Hṛdayadhara, the father of Lakṣmīdhara was also *Mahāsāndhivigrahika.*

[4] This is evident from the pious allocutions in some of their inscriptions, and from the claim of Candradeva that he was the protector of the holy places of Kās'i, Kus'ika, Uttarakosala, and Indrasthāniya, as well as from the general tenor of their rule.

KALPATARU EARLIER THAN MITĀKṢARĀ

To sum up. Any possibility of Lakṣmīdhara's making a reference to Vijñānesvara is ruled out on two grounds mainly, *viz.* : (1) the dictates of prudence, because no sensible Minister will cite as an authority an adherent of his king's rival or enemy; and (2) the impossibility of an earlier work quoting a later. For, it follows from the data already adduced that the *Kalpataru*, should have been composed about A. D. 1110, early in the reign of Govindacandra, while the *Mitākṣarā* could not have been completed before A. D. 1120. In any case, the *Mitākṣarā*, even if it had been composed a few years before the *Kalpataru*, could not have assumed sufficient importance in the eye of so proud a scholar as Lakṣmīdhara, who has described his many claims as a *nibandha*-writer, as to make him rank it as authority with Gopāla's *Kāmadhenu*, *Pārijāta*, *Prakāśa*, *Mahārṇava*, Halāyudha, and *Mālā*, referred to either in the introductory verses or cited in the body of the *Kalpataru*.[1] The alleged citation of Vijñāne-svara by Lakṣmīdhara has accordingly to be rejected as spurious.

VERBAL IDENTITY BETWEEN BOTH WORKS

In an examination of the *Vyavahārakāṇḍa* three instances have come to light in which the interpretation of certain *smṛti* verses is in almost the same words in both the *Mitākṣarā* and the *Kalpataru*. The verbal identity may be accidental, as the verses are not difficult, or the commentary may have been copied

Lakṣmidhara is critical of the predecessors whom he names. He claims that after the composition of the *Kalpataru* the splendour of the *Mahārṇava*, was lost. The *Kāmadhenu* had to slumber at the foot of the *Kalpataru*, and inferior works like the *Mala* need not be counted at all among those that would be treated with regard after his own composition came out. The claims are urged in these two verses :

यस्योत्थितौ स्थितमती न महार्णवे श्रीः
निद्रां ददाति यदधः किल कामधेनुः ।
तस्यास्तनिष्यति रतिं विबुधद्विजानां
आनन्दितुं किमु न कल्पतरोः प्ररोहः ॥
का चिन्तैव महार्णवानुसरणे का कामधेनुस्पृहा
क्षुद्राः कस्य परिस्फुरन्ति हृदये ते (रत्न) मालादयः ।
श्रीलक्ष्मीधरबुद्धिवैभवसुधासेकप्रभावादयं
येनात्रैव जगत्त्रयोपकृतये कल्पद्रुमः कल्पते ॥

from an earlier writer by both authors. Ingenuity may see in the prayer of Vijñānes'vara that his work, his city and king should last as long as the *Kalpalatā*, a concealed compliment to the *Kalpataru*.[1] Such a surmise will not be ruled out as improbable if both writers had been attached to the court of the same ruler or of friendly kings. The circumstance that their allegiance was divided, between two powerful and passively hostile kings, makes the suggestion weak. But, whether the two writers knew each other or not,[2] it is a mark of the powerful wave of Hindu feeling, which was stimulated by the Muhammadan attacks and the rise of new states, that such cardinal works as those of Lakṣmīdhara, Vijñānes'vara and Aparārka should have been produced in the same generation.

[1] *Cf.* Ākalpam sthiramastu Kalpalatikā-kalpam tadetattrayam.

[2] Govindacandra is referred to, not only by Musalman writers, but by Lakṣmīdhara himself as the Ruler of Kās'i (Benares). Many of his grants were made there after bathing at one or other of its holy tirthas. Lakṣmīdhara must have himself resided there, and been a well-known figure. If, as is probable, Vijñānes'vara made the routine pilgrimage to Kās'i the two may have met though it might have been after their respective works were composed.

NOTE A

LAKṢMĪDHARA has prefixed fifteen verses to the first book of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*, which deals with the first *ās'rama* and forms also an introduction to the whole work. Of these, the first three contain prayers to Viṣṇu, who seems to have been Lakṣmīdhara's tutelary deity, S'iva and Manu. The invocation of Manu is appropriate as Lakṣmīdhara proposes to expound *Dharma*. The next four verses contain a panegyric with historical allusions to Lakṣmīdhara's patron and king, Govindacandra. The remaining eight verses set forth the author's qualifications and the merits of the work. Besides these fifteen verses, the *Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa* has an introductory verse, in which again Lakṣmīdhara describes his own prowess by which his enemies were reduced to the life of hardship and austerity prescribed for Brahmacārins. To each of the succeeding thirteen kāṇḍas a similar verse is prefixed in which similar justification for his dealing with the subject of each book is adduced. These verses furnish the only direct information on Lakṣmīdhara's career and achievements. We learn from them that he had enemies over whom he ruthlessly triumphed, that he was a wealthy *gṛhastha*, whose life was an example to others, that he performed with diligence and scrupulous care the prescribed rites for a Brāhmaṇa and made *Dharma* forget its "separation from the Golden Age," that he duly discharged the duties to ancestors in the way of s'rāddhas, that he made many *agrahārasthāpanas*, that he founded on the pilgrim routes *satrālayas*, that he was the "holiest of the holy", in view of his purificatory rites, that his exposition of law as a judge roused the spontaneous admiration of the learned, that his "assumption of the sacred duty (*yajña*) of the protection of the Universe" (in plain prose, his prime ministership) brought peace and purification from sin to countless people, and that he was deeply versed in Vedānta and the way of salvation.

These verses are in many places corrupt, and have had to be restored. This has been so particularly in regard to the sixteen s'lokas with which the first *kāṇḍa* begins. Only a single manuscript of *Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa* is so far known, and it is very defective. It has lost the last pages of the kāṇḍa, making it difficult to publish it first. Its publication is held over in the hope that one other manuscript of it at least will come to light. The prefatory verses have been reconstructed with the help of Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph. D., of the Sanskrit Department of the University of Madras. They are reproduced below, as restored. The English translation which follows the text is Dr. Raghavan's. The introductory verse of the sixth book which deals with *pratiṣṭhā* is wanting in the Udaipūr Palace manuscript of it, and the work begins abruptly. A second manuscript, which I was able to secure, has also lost the first leaf which would have contained the introductory s'loka. The mansucripts of the *pūjā* and *vrata* sections are similarly defective. The headings do not occur in the manuscript.

प्रार्थना

(विष्णुः)

देवः स्पुरन्महिमतत्तदनन्तमत्स्यकूर्मादिजन्मकथिताऽद्भुतवैभवो यः ।
ब्रह्माण्डबुद्बुदतया स्फुरदंशलेशः मायामपोहतु स बोधमहोदधिर्वः ॥ १ ॥

(शिवः)

जाने यस्य ललाटलोचनशिखा, लेखाऽपि चन्द्री, विभो
रंमाशोममयं (?) जगज्जनयितुं बीजाय सञ्जायते ।
तस्योर्मिव्यपयोगियोगिजनताहृत्पद्मसद्मस्थित-
स्फारध्वान्तहरं हरस्य दहरस्थानं महामो महः ॥ २ ॥

(मनुः)

सुहृद्यः सुकृताऽपुण्यक्षीरनीरविवेचनः ।
मनुमानसमाविश्य राजहंसः पुनातु वः ॥ ३ ॥

राज्ञः प्रशंसा

श्रीमन्मानववासवस्य विजयी **गोविन्दचन्द्रो**ऽस्ति यः
क्रीडातर्जित**गौड**गर्जितभयस्तम्भीभवत्पार्थिवः ।
सर्वोर्वीन्द्रजयप्रतिश्रुतिवियत्संकोचनाशंकिना
येनात्माऽपि जितस्ततश्शमभृता मन्ये किमन्ये परे ॥ ४ ॥
एष ज्ञानपराक्रमैकवसतिः **गोविन्दचन्द्रः** परं
कन्दर्पस्य च वैरिणाञ्च विशिखैः रक्तोऽभितः शोभते ।
मायामप्यवनीशमण्डलमपि स्वच्छन्दमुच्छिन्दता
येनाऽऽत्मा कृतिना दिनैः कतिपयैरद्वैतमारोपितः ॥ ५ ॥
कोशान् गेहेष्वमुञ्चन् पथि करितुरगान् बान्धवानर्धमार्गे
दुर्गेष्वन्तःपुराणि प्रतिरवचकिताः पर्वतेभ्यो निवृत्ताः ।
यस्योद्योगे द्रवन्तोऽसमसमरसमारंभगम्भीरभेरी-
भाङ्काराकीर्णकर्णज्वरभरतरलप्रेक्षिताः शात्रवेशाः ॥ ६ ॥
स किल सकलदृप्तक्षत्रनक्षत्रलक्ष्मीहरणकिरणमाली कस्य न स्यान्नमस्यः ।
असमसमरसंपल्लम्पटः शौर्यभाजामवधिरवधि युद्धे येन **हम्मीरर्वीरः** ॥ ७ ॥

ग्रन्थकर्तुः प्रशंसा

विद्यावल्लिविलासभूरुहवरो वीरस्य विप्रोत्तमः
श्री**लक्ष्मीधर** इत्यचिन्त्यमहिमा तस्यास्ति मन्त्रीश्वरः ।
भूभर्तुः पदचक्रवाकमिथुनक्रीडार्थमासूत्रिता
येनाऽनेकनरेन्द्ररत्नमकुटज्योतिर्मयी वाहिनी ॥ ८ ॥
हुत्वा लक्षमरातिभूपतिशिरःपद्मानि शौर्यानले
पृथ्वीं साधयता समुद्रवसनां श्रीदेव**काशीपतेः** ।
एतेनोत्तमसाधकेन कति न क्रूराशयाः प्रापिताः
सङ्ग्रामव्रतनैष्ठिकेन विलयं विद्यार्थिना पार्थिवाः ॥ ९ ॥

ग्रन्थस्य प्रशंसा

तेनायं वेदमूलः स्मृतिनिचयमयस्कन्धवान् यः पुराण-
व्यूहव्युत्पन्नशाखः प्रकरणनिकरोद्दण्डकाण्डप्रचण्डः ।

उन्मीलद्वाक्यपत्रः स्फुरदतिविशदज्ञानरम्यप्रसूनः
श्रीमद्धर्मार्थकामाऽमृतमयफलदस्तन्यते **कल्पवृक्षः** ॥ १० ॥
पौराणीरिव वाणीः क्वचिदकृतकृतौ क्वापि भूयस्स्मृतीनां
गोपालस्तद्वयस्यः स्वकृतिविरचनं वाक्यरूपेण चक्रे ।
श्रौतस्मार्तादिसारैर्विबुधजनमनोहारि कारिष्यतेऽयं
मीमांसोत्तंसितार्थैरपृथुरथ कथातीतरन्ध्रः प्रबन्धः ॥ ११ ॥
यस्योत्थितौ स्थितिमती न **महार्णवे** श्रीः
निद्रां दधाति यदधः किल **कामधेनुः** ।
तस्याऽऽतनिष्यति रतिं विबुधद्विजानाम्
आनन्दनः किमु न **कल्पतरोः** प्ररोहः ॥ १२ ॥
का चिन्तैव **महार्णवानुसरणे** का **कामधेनुस्पृहा**
क्षुद्राः कस्य परिस्फुरन्ति हृदये ते [**रत्न**]**माला**दयः ।
श्रीलक्ष्मीधरबुद्धिवैभवसुधासेकप्रभावादयं
येनाऽत्रैव जगत्त्रयोपकृतये **कल्पद्रुमः** कल्पते ॥ १३ ॥
ग्कार्थेष्वेकमेकं क्वचिदपरमपि स्वीकृतं कार्ययोगात्
न्यस्तं विज्ञानमूलं प्रचरदपि परित्यक्तमज्ञानमूलम् ।
शिष्टैस्सम्यग्गृहीतं वचनमभिहितं स्पष्टितं चाऽस्फुटार्थं
यत्राऽपारो विरोधः स्फुरति विरचिता तेन तत्र व्यवस्था ॥ १४ ॥
लक्ष्मीधरेण मुनिमुख्यवचस्समुद्रं
न्यायाद्रिणा किल विलोड्य समुद्धृतोऽयम् ।
काण्डैश्चतुर्दशभिरद्भुतपर्वबन्धैः
वाञ्छोचितं फलति **कल्पतरुर्न** कस्य ॥ १५ ॥

काण्डोपक्रमश्लोकाः

[ब्रह्मचारिकाण्डोपक्रमे---]

विशाला (?) विमुखाः क्षतेन्द्रियसुखाः क्ष्मातल्पनिद्रालवो
भिक्षावृत्तिजुषस्त्वचा परिचिताः कौपीनमात्राम्बराः ।
नीताः **कान्स्यधिपस्य** येन रिपवस्ते ब्रह्मचर्यं परं
काण्डे स प्रथमाश्रमं प्रथमतः प्रस्तौति **लक्ष्मीधरः** ॥ १ ॥

[गृहस्थकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

स्वाध्यायाधिगमोऽर्थतत्त्वगतये सा कर्मनिष्पत्तये
सा निश्शेषमलक्षयाय स पुनर्मोक्षाय यस्याऽभवत् ।
दत्तानेकपुरद्विजोत्तमवधूसंगीतनादोत्सवो
गार्हस्थ्यं वदति द्वितीयमधुना काण्डं स **लक्ष्मीधरः** ॥ २ ॥

[नैयतकालकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

येन प्रत्यहमभ्रसिन्धुपयसि स्नानादिभिः कर्मभिः
यज्ञैः कर्मभिः [पञ्चभिः] अप्यपास्तकलिभिर्नीतः परामुन्नतिम् ।
धर्मो विस्मृतवान् कृतस्य विरहक्लेशं स **लक्ष्मीधरः**
काण्डं **नैयतकालिकं** कलयति प्रीत्यै तृतीयं सताम् ॥ ३ ॥

[श्राद्धकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

यः पुण्यात्मा धिनोति प्रतिदिनममितैर्हन्तकारैर्मनुष्यान्
कव्यैरव्याजभव्यैः पितृगणममरस्तोममस्तोकहव्यैः ।
श्रीनाथध्यानसिन्धुप्लवनसुखरसोपेतचेतोमरालः
स **श्रीलक्ष्मीधरो**ऽयं विरचयति सुधीः **श्राद्धकाण्डं** चतुर्थम् ॥ ४ ।

[दानकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

येनाविच्छेदवेदध्वनिहतकलिभिः श्रोत्रियाणां पुरीभिः
फुल्लाब्जामोदमाद्यन्मधुकरमुखरव्योमभागैस्तडागैः ।
चक्रे धात्री पवित्रा विभववितरणैरर्थिवाञ्छातिरिक्तैः
स श्रीमानेष **लक्ष्मीधर** इह तनुते पञ्चमं **दानकाण्डम्** ॥ ५ ॥

[तीर्थकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

धर्मे निर्मलहेमकुम्भशिरसो यस्यामराणां गृहाः
संख्यातीतमुमुक्षुभिक्षुपरिषन्मित्राणि सत्रालयाः ।
तीर्थेषु प्रथयन्ति धर्मनगरद्वारानुकारास्तुलां (?)
काण्डे **तीर्थविवेचनं** वितनुते **लक्ष्मीधरस्सो**ऽष्टमे ॥ ६ ॥

[शुद्धिकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

वर्णादप्युचितार्जनादपि भृशं शुद्धैर्यदीयैरमी
दौर्गत्यादपि दुष्कृतादपि गताः शुद्धिं द्विजाः काञ्चनैः ।
धर्मेन्दोरुदयाचलः स दशमे काण्डेऽत्र **लक्ष्मीधरः**
शुद्धिं शुद्धिमतां वरो विरचयत्याचारवारान्निधिः ॥ ७ ॥

[राजधर्मकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि यज्जगद्गुणवतां गेहेषु यद्दन्तिनो
राज्ञां मूर्धनि यत्पदं व्यरचयद्गोविन्दचन्द्रो नृपः ।
तत्सर्वं खलु यस्य मन्त्रमहिमाऽऽश्चर्यं स **लक्ष्मीधरः**
काण्डे शंसति **राजधर्म**निचयानेकादशे पुण्यधीः ॥ ८ ॥

[व्यवहारकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

नानाशास्त्रवचोविचारचतुरप्रज्ञाबलस्थापित-
न्यायादिव्यवहारमार्गविशदास्तास्ताः प्रगल्भा गिरः ।
यस्याऽऽकर्ण्य विपश्चितः प्रतिसभं रोमाञ्चमातन्वते
काण्डे स **व्यवहार**मत्र तनुते **लक्ष्मीधरो** द्वादशे ॥ ९ ॥

[शान्तिकाण्डोपक्रमे —]

यस्मिन्बिभ्रति विश्वपालनमहायज्ञं द्विजन्मोत्तमे
प्राप्ताः शान्तमलीमसास्सुरुचयः पुष्टिं परां साधवः ।
काण्डं **शान्तिकपौष्टिका**श्रयमथ ब्रूते स **लक्ष्मीधरो**
धौरेयः कृतिनां त्रयोदशमिह प्रज्ञालतापादपः ॥ १० ॥

[मोक्षकाण्डोमक्रमे —]

वेदान्तोक्तिविवेकवैभवगलद्दुर्वारमायातम-
स्वैरोन्मीलदमेयचिन्मयपरब्रह्मैकतानात्मने ।
ते यस्मै स्पृहयन्ति लब्धपरमानन्दास्सनन्दादयः
काण्डे वक्ति चतुर्दशे द्विजवरो **मोक्षं** स **लक्ष्मीधरः** ॥ ११ ॥

TRANSLATION—INTRODUCTORY VERSES

1. May that God, the great ocean of Knowledge, remove Delusion. He whose miraculous powers are proclaimed by the several endless and glorious incarnations of the Fish, the Tortoise and others, and but a fraction of whose aspect quivers as the bubble of cosmos.
2. We adore that effulgence in the heart of Hara which destroys the vast darkness in the heart (lotus-like abode of heart) of the yogic persons who free themselves from the (sixfold) waves (of misery, delusion etc.) that Lord Hara the flame of whose forehead-eye and whose lunar digit, methinks, become.......... the germ for creating the universe.

    (Part of the second line of the verse could not be reconstructed.)
3. May the good-hearted Manu, foremost among kings, who discriminates the good and the sinful, even as the charming kingly swan, diving in the Mānasa lake would discriminate milk and water, enter your mind and purify you.
4. There is the victorious king Govindacandra whose mere sport threatened the Gauḍa king whose (panicky) shout (in turn) alarmed to stupefaction all other kings. Need it be mentioned that he subdued the other enemies, he who restrained (literally conquered) his own self, being a man of self-possession, from the conquest of all the kings, fearing that the skies would shrink if he took the vow to conquer all the kings ?
5. This unique abode of knowledge and valour, Govindacandra, shines ruddy all around with the shafts of the god of Love and enemies alike ; the successful Govindacandra who, by freely uprooting both Illusion and enemy-kingdom, established himself within a few days as Absolute, without a second.
6. In whose campaign, the fleeing enemy kings, with their looks reeling with the weight of panic caused by the deep noises of the drums (sounding) at the

beginning of the unequal battle, turn back from mountain (caves) frightened by the echoes, and leave their treasuries in their abodes, their elephants and horses on the highway, their kinsmen in halfway and their harem in the fort.

7. The Sun who puts out the splendour of all the haughty kings who are merely like so many stars, by whom will that Govindacandra be not respected ?—He who killed in battle the heroic Hammira, a paragon of valour who was eager for the fortune of an unequal combat.

8. To that heroic king there is the chief minister, foremost Brāhmaṇa of unimaginable greatness, Lakṣmīdara, an excellent tree for the creeper of learning to grow upon; he, who for the sport of the Cakravāka-birds of his king's feet, provided a river in the form of the glitter of the jewelled diadems of numerous kings.

9. How many wicked kings have not been made to disappear by him who initiated himself in the battle-vow, a seeker of miraculous power and an excellent votary (accomplisher), who in the fire of his valour, made oblations by a lakh of lotuses in the form of enemy kings' heads and performed the rite of securing for the king of Kāsī the sea-girt earth.

10. By him is raised this Divine Tree (work called Kalpataru) of which the Vedas are the roots, the Smṛtis the boughs, the Purāṇas the branches, formidable with the long stalks of numerous Prakaraṇas, spreading the leaves of quotations, fluttering with the beautiful blossoms of pure knowledge and giving the fruits of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa (Amṛta).

11. Now he extracted passages from the Purāṇas and now again, from the Smṛtis; thus did Lakṣmīdhara's friend, Gopāla, make his work a mere collection of quotations. But this compact work shall be done, with no loophole to complain of, satisfying the minds of the learned, with the essence of the Vedas and the Smṛtis, and with its ideas crowned with interpretations and discussions.

12. Will not the delightful growth of Kalpataru, (the celestial tree and this work) give joy to the birds of the learned (the Brāhmans and the gods), the Kalpataru after whose appearance, excellence (Lakṣmi) does not stay in the great ocean (the work Mahārṇava) and at whose feet the celestial milch cow (the work Kāmadhenu) sleeps (remains an unopened book) ?
13. Now that this Kalpadruma, thanks to the efficacy of the ambrosial watering of the intellectual powers of Lakṣmīdhara, is here, capable of helping the three worlds, why think even of going after the great ocean (the work Mahārṇava) ? Why desire for the celestial cow (the work Kāmadhenu) ? In whose mind will occur those trifling things, gem-necklace etc. (works like the Ratnamālā) ?
14. Of authorities on the identical topic, a single text has been adopted at one place, and another at another place, as purpose required ; that which is based on knowledge has been kept and that which is based on ignorance has been abandoned, though it is current ; the view adopted fully by the authorities has been taken and that which was ambiguous has been clarified ; and where there was an endless controversy, there a finding has been made by Lakṣmīdhara.
15. To whom will not this celestial tree (the work Kalpataru) give the fruit, according to desire, the Kalpataru with wonderful nodes (sections) and fourteen branches (books), and which has been raised by Lakṣmīdhara, out of the ocean of sayings of the chief seers, churning it with the mountain of his interpretation.

OPENING S'LOKAS OF EACH KĀṆḌA

1. Lakṣmīdhara begins the first Ās'rama in the first book, he who reduced to Brahmacārya the enemies of the king of Kās'i, enemies who (like the Brahmacārins) had to turn away form, were deprived of sense-pleasures, had to sleep on a bed of earth, took to

begging alms, accustomed themselves to hides, and had but loincloths as dress.

2. Lakṣmīdhara now gives out the second book on the subject of Household life, he who learnt and recited the Vedas for realising the truth of their meaning, realised that meaning so that his karmans may properly be done, did his karmans properly for the total destruction of impurity, had his impurities destroyed for the purpose of deliverance,—Lakṣmīdhara who was responsible for the music festivities of the ladies of the excellent Brahmins to whom he had gifted many habitations.

3. Lakṣmīdhara writes for the satisfaction of the good the third book on Niyatakāla, he who, by his daily duties like bathing in the Ganges and by his Kali-scaring five-fold yajñas, took Dharma to a great height and made it forget the pang of separation from the Kṛta age.

4. The wise Lakṣmīdhara writes the fourth S'rāddha Kāṇḍa, the swan of whose heart has the delectation of the joy of floating in the river of the meditation of Viṣṇu, that blessed soul, who, everyday gratifies men with unbounded offerings due to guests, the manes with guileless and happy Kavya-offerings and the gods with abundant kavya-offerings.

5. Lakṣmīdhara does here the fifth Dāna Kāṇḍa, he who sanctified the earth with gifts of wealth over-reaching the ambitions of the supplicants, by (the construction of) tanks whose atmosphere was resounding with (the hum of) the bees reeling in the odour of the blown lotuses, and by (the foundation of) towns of Vedic scholars which put an end to Kali through unbroken Vedic recitations.

6. Lakṣmīdhara examines the subject of Tīrthas in the eighth Chapter, he whose dharma is proclaimed by temples with bright golden finials, by resthouses accommodating collections of numberless recluses and mendicants and (portals or arches or stepways ?) resembling portals to the City of Dharma, at bathing ghats.

7. In this tenth book, Lakṣmīdhara, the rising mount for the moon of merit, the foremost of the pure, the ocean of approved modes of action, deals with S'uddhi, he through whose gold, pure in colour (or carat) and in the method of their acquisition through proper ways Brāhmanas were freed from poverty and improper acts.
8. Lakṣmīdhara speaks of the Rājadharma in the eleventh kāṇḍa, he whose mind is in meritorious acts, and thanks to whose miraculous great counsel, king Govindacandra was able to do all that, *viz.*, the placing of the world on the righteous path, the placing of elephants in the house of men of qualities, and the placing of his own feet on the head of kings.
9. Lakṣmīdhara deals here in the twelfth book with Vyavahāra, whose several authoritative words at the meetings of the court, clear in their procedure, with principles established by the force of his intellect rendered capable by his investigations in several s'āstras, the wise listen to and feel thrilled.
10. Lakṣmīdhara, the tree supporting the creeper of intelligence, the foremost of the successful, speaks then of the thirteenth book here dealing with Rites propitiatory and acceleratory, while which great Brāhman was doing the great yajña of protecting the universe, the good men had all their distresses put down and with great lustre, attained supreme welfare.
11. Lakṣmīdhara, that excellent Brāhmaṇa speaks of Mokṣa in the fourteenth chapter, he whose soul is in unison with the Supreme Spirit of the form of the inscrutable knowledge, freely manifesting itself when the irremovable darkness of Māyā drops as a result of the abundant discriminatory knowledge of the words of the Vedānta, and for whom Sananda and other (Siddhas) who have attained the Supreme Bliss, yearn.

same verses as the *Mitākṣarā.* He probably did so, because to kings like him the subject had peculiar attraction and value.

That Lakṣmīdhara's interest in gifts (*dāna*) was not merely theoretical is shown by the claims he puts forward in the s'loka introducing the *Dānakāṇḍa.*[1] He proudly declares that the Lakṣmīdhara, who devotes his fifth discourse to *dāna* is he "who sanctified the Earth with gifts surpassing the expectations and hopes of supplicants, with tanks (that he had constructed out of his bounty) which resounded with the hum of bees attracted by the fragrance of the full-blown lotuses that filled them, and with towns of Vedic scholars, whose uninterrupted Vedic chant dispersed the darkness of the Kali age."[2] In founding *agrahāras* and excavating tanks, he was fulfilling not only the duty which he describes at length as lying on all affluent *gṛhasthas* to spend their wealth in pious ways, but was setting an example to his own sovereign, whose many inscriptions give evidence of an abiding faith in the saving virtues of gifts made in accordance with the s'āstras. The wide vogue of *dāna* is illustrated by another significant instance. Caṇḍes'vara, whose *Dānaratnākara,* like all his other works, is virtually a rehash of the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru,* actually performed the *Tulādāna* in A. D. 1314.[3] In later times, after Hemādri had embodied in the *Dānakaṇḍa* of his great digest, the *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi,* all previous teachings on gifts, kings, who made the *mahādānas,* used to describe themselves as those who had performed the *mahādānas* described by Hemādri.[4]

Pre-Kalpataru Treatment of Dāna

If not the earliest digest to deal extensively with Gifts, the *Kṛtya-kalpataru* is without doubt the earliest, which deals with

[1] *See* the *mangalas'loka* on p. 1 *infra.*

[2] *Apāsta-kalibhiḥ* is an expression which occurs also in inscriptions.

[3] p. 14 of the Introduction by K. P. Jayaswal to his ed. of the *Rajanitiratnakara* (1924).

[4] *Epigraphia Carnatica,* VIII, Tirthahalli, 12. In *Rasarṇava-Sudhakara* of Simha-bhūpāla (c. 1360 A.D.) the following verse appears :

हेमाद्रिदानैः धरणीसुराणां महाचलं हस्तगतं विहाय ।
यः चारुसोपानपथेन चक्रे श्रीपर्वतं सर्वजनप्रगम्यम् ॥

The reference is to the flight of steps at S'ris'ailām or Mallikārjuna-Kṣetra.

the subject adequately. It is noteworthy that though Lakṣmīdhara refers, in other works of his, to predecessors like the authors of the *Prakās'a*, *Pārijāta*, *Kāmadhenu* and possibly a *Mahārṇava*, as well as to Halāyudha, not one of these is alluded to or cited in the *Dāna-Kalpataru*. Almost coeval with him is Aparārka, whose treatment of *dāna* is unusually full, as already noticed, and who cites no earlier digest, or commentary. The *Dānasāgara* of Ballāla Sena (composed in S'āka 1091, *i.e.*, A.D. 1161-69) refers to the *Kalpataru*. A comparison of the printed fragments of this work with the *Kalpataru* shows that the material of the latter is utilised and expanded by the addition of *prayoga-vidhi* (procedure) for each *dāna*, and for donors following each Veda, with a recapitulation of the Vedic *mantras* to be recited at the time, which are only named or alluded to by Lakṣmīdhara. It would be open to presume from the circumstance that later writers on *dāna* like Caṇḍes'vara (c. A.D. 1314), Madanasimha, Hemādri and Mitra Mis'ra expanded only the *Dāna-Kalpataru*, building their own works round the core of Lakṣmīdhara's book but for one circumstance, *viz.* that Caṇḍes'vara cites the following digests, *viz. Kāmadhenu* (once on p. 118, Adyar Transcript), *Prakās'a* (*ib.* fol. 59, 78 and 341), *Pārijātā* (fol. 66, 83, 152, 155, 260, 270 and 356) and *Bhūpālapaddhati* (fol. 84, 102, 152, 161, 170, 171, 173, 192, 197, 206 and 326), among which all but the last are pre-*Kalpataru*. The citations of *Pārijāta* and *Bhūpālapaddhati* alone relate to *dāna* pure and simple. Whether the former of these two was a digest which treated of *dāna* also, or separately, it is evident that Lakṣmīdhara's work superseded it completely, and that for all later literature on gifts the source was only the *Dāna-Kalpataru*.

VEDIC LITERATURE ON GIFTS

Nāras'amsāḥ

The literature of gifts (*dāna*) has great antiquity, and its importance and underlying principles are recognized in Vedic literature. In the *Ṛg Veda* there is a whole class of hymns known as *dāna-stuti*, in praise of gifts and liberality. They reflect the gratitude of priests for the extra-ordinary munificence

shown by royal patrons. Among the donors commemorated are king Svanaya (*R.V.*, I, 125, 126), Taranta, Purumīha and Rathavītī (*R.V.*, V, 61), Sudāsa Paijavana (*R.V.*, VII, 18), Kas'u Caidya (VIII, 5), Tirindīra Pāras'avya (*R.V.*), Kānīta (*R.V.*, VIII, 46) and S'āvarṇi (*R.V.*, X, 62). The vast dimensions of the commemorated gifts perhaps conceal poetical exaggeration. The liberality of such patrons was to be held up to the admiration of later generations by legends which had to be recited at sacrifices. Such stories are described as "praise of men" (*nāras'amsā*) and, the *S'āṅkhāyana-s'rauta-sūtra* (XVI, 11)[1] mentions the following as fit for such recital; the legend of S'unasṣepha; the story of Kakṣivat Aus'iga, who received gifts from Svanaya Bhāvya; the story of S'yāvās'va Ārcanānasa, who received gifts from Vindadas'vi; the gifts of the carpenter Bṛbu to Bharadvāja; the story of Vasiṣṭha, the *purohita* of Sudās Paijavana; the story of Vatsa Kāṇva, who received gifts from Pṛthus'ravas Kānīna: the account of Praskaṇva, who got presents from Medhya Mātaris'va and of the Mānava who received gifts from Angiras. The currency of similar legends of liberality is evidenced from the well-known recital of the names of a number of famous donors in the *Mahābhārata*[2], cited also by Mitra Mis'ra in *Dānaprakās'a* (Adyar Transcript, I, fol. 13-14). Among them are Rantideva, S'ibi Aus'īnara, Pratardana king of Kās'ī, Devavrata, Ātreya Samkṛti, Ambarīṣa, Yuvanās'va, Jāmadagnya, Mitrasaha, and Sahasrajit.

Dānastuti

The typical *Dānastuti* not only praises individual instances of liberality in royal patrons, but lauds liberality itself in general terms, pointing out its spiritual advantages to the giver. Thus, *R.V.*, I, 125 (4-7) has:[3]

[1] ed. A. Hillebrandt, *Bibliotheca India*, III, (1897), pp. 369—371 :
सर्वाण्येतानि आरव्यानानि नराणां पुरुषाणां दक्षिणाप्रशंसकानीत्येन रूपेण भवन्ति । पुरुषरूपः पुमाक्षररूपेण प्रशस्यत इति नारशंसः । नरैर्वा परमात्मदर्शिभिः श्रद्धदानैः प्रशस्यत इति नारशंसः ॥

[2] *infra.* pp. 272-274.

[3] उपक्षरन्ति सिन्धवो मयो भुव ईजानं च यक्ष्माणं च धेनवः । पृणन्त च पपुरिं च श्रवस्यवो घृतस्य धारा उप यन्ति विश्वतः ॥ ४ ॥ नाकस्य पृष्ठे अधि तिष्ठति श्रितो यः

To him who freely gives and fills on all sides full streams of fatness flow and make him famous.

On the high ridge of heaven he stands, exalted, yea, to the gods he goes, the liberal giver.

The streams, the waters flow for him with fatness ; to him this guerdon ever yields abundance.

For those who give rich meeds are all these splendours, for those who give rich meeds suns shine in heaven.

The givers of rich meeds are made immortal ; the givers of rich fees prolong their lifetime.

Let not the liberal sink in sin and sorrow, never decay the pious chiefs who worship.

Let every man besides be their protection, and let afflictions fall upon the niggard.

R.V., X, 107 is a long paean of praise of liberality. It says with emphasis :[1]

8. The liberal die not, never are they ruined ; the liberal suffer neither harm or trouble.

9. The light of heaven, the universe about us—all this does sacrificial guerdon (*dakṣiṇā*) give them.

11. Assist ye gods, the liberal man in battles ; the liberal giver conquers foes in combat.

R.V., X, 117, 1-4, lauds in striking terms the giver of food to the hungry, and is the Vedic basis of *Annadāna* :

The gods have not ordained hunger to be our death ; even to the well-fed man comes death in varied shape.

2. The man with food in store who, when the needy comes in miserable case, begging for food to eat, hardens his heart against him—even when of

पृणाति स ह देवेषु गच्छति । तस्मा आपो घृतमर्षन्ति सिन्धवस्तस्मा इयं दक्षिणा पिन्वते सदा ॥ ५ ॥ दक्षिणावतामिदमानि चित्रा दक्षिणावतां दिवि सूर्यासः । दक्षिणावन्तो अमृतं भजन्ते दक्षिणावन्तः प्रतिरन्त आयुः ॥ ६ ॥ मा पृणन्तो दुरितमेन आरन्मा जारिषुः सूरयः सुव्रतासः । अन्यस्तेषां परिधिरस्तु कश्चिदपृणन्तमभि सं यन्तु शोकाः ॥ ७ ॥

[1] न भोजा मम्रुर्न न्यर्थमीयुर्न रिष्यन्ति न व्यथन्ते ह भोजाः । इदं यद्विश्वं भुवनं स्वश्चैतत्सर्वं दक्षिणैभ्यो ददाति ॥ ८ ॥ भोजा जिग्युः सुरभिं योनिमग्रे भोजा जिग्युर्वध्वं १ या सुवासाः ॥ भोजा जिग्युरन्तः पेयं सुराय । भोजा जिग्युर्ये अहूताः प्रयन्ति ॥ ९ ॥ भोजमश्वाः सुष्ठुवाहो वहन्ति सुवृद्रथो वर्तते दक्षिणायाः । भोजं देवासोऽवता भरेषु भोजः शत्रून्त्समनीकेषु जेता ॥ ११ ॥

old he did him service—finds not one to comfort him.

3. Bounteous is he who gives unto the beggar, who comes to him in want of food and feeble. Success attends him in the shout of battle. He makes a friend of him in future troubles.[1]

The praise of liberality is of the gifts of sacrificial fee or *dakṣiṇā.* The fee took not only the form of gold, but more usually was in the form articles of personal property such as kine, horses, buffaloes, or camels, ornaments etc. Land is not mentioned as a *dakṣiṇā* except with disapproval (*S'atapatha-Brāhmaṇa* XII, vii, 1, 15).[2] The rule that when no article is specified for the fee, the cow is meant (*Kātyāyana-S'rauta-Sūtra,* xv, 2, 13)[3] indicates that the old fee was a cow. As *dakṣiṇā* means "prolific," a word which aptly describes the cow, the term came to apply generally to fee or guerdon. No sacrifice was complete without a *dakṣiṇā,* and the number of fees or occasions for their payment in a sacrifice is specified *e.g.*, 33 in a *Sautrāmaṇī.* The *S'atapatha-Brāhmaṇa*[4] (II, 2, 2) derives the term from *dakṣaya,* 'to invigorate,' and points out that the fee invigorates the gods by being paid to the priest. The glory of the sacrifice is the gift; the priest should not therefore give it

[1] न वा उ देवाः क्षुधमिद्वधं ददुरुताशितमुपगच्छन्ति मृत्यवः ।
उतो रयिः पृणतो नोप दस्यत्युतापृणन्मर्डितांरं न विन्दते ॥
य आध्राय चकमानाय पित्वो ऽन्नवान्त्सनफितायो पजग्मुषे ।
स्थिरं मनः कृणुते सेवते पुरीतो चित्स मडितारं न विन्दते ॥
स इद्भोजो यो गृहवे ददात्यन्नकामाय चरिते कृशाय ।
अरमस्यै भवति यामहूता उतापरीषु कृणुते सरवायम् ॥
न सखा यो न ददाति सरव्ये स चाभुवे स चमानायपित्वः ।
आपस्यात्प्रेयान्न तदोको अस्ति पृणन्तमन्यमरणं चिदिच्छेत् ॥

[2] त॰ ह कश्यपो याज्ञयां चकरा । तदपि भूमिः श्लोकं जगौ 'न मा मर्त्यः कश्चन दातुमर्हति विश्वकर्मम्भौवन मन्द आसिथ उपसंक्ष्यति स्या सलिलस्य मध्ये मृषैष ते संगरः कश्यपायेति ॥ ed. A. Weber, 1855, p. 1002.

[3] अलिङ्गग्रहणे गौः सर्वत्र ॥ ed. Vidyādhara, 1924, II, p. 56.

[4] तं देवा दक्षिणाभिरदक्षयंस्तद्यदेनं दक्षिणाभिरदक्षयं स्तस्माद्दक्षिणा नाम तद्यदेवात्र यज्ञस्य हतस्य व्यथते तदेवास्यैतद्दक्षिणाभिर्दक्षयत्यथ समृद्धं एव यज्ञो भवति तस्माद्दक्षिणा ददाति ॥ (*Ibid.*, p. 146)

away, atleast on the day he receives it. (*ib.* XIV, 1, 32).[1] It should be given freely by the sacrificer, and " let there be no bargaining as to *dakṣiṇā*, for by bargaining the priests are deprived of their place in heaven " (*ib.* IX, 5, 16).[2] The sacrificer " ransoms himself when the *dakṣiṇā* is accepted ". (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, XV, 1) and the fee strengthens (*dakṣayati*) the sacrifice. The *Taittirīya Saṁhita* (V, 6, 9)[3] insists on the necessity for *dakṣiṇā* : " Him who piles his fire, he should enrich with sacrificial gifts, for thereby, verily, he preserves the sacrifice."

Free Gifts

The *dakṣiṇa* is given within the *vedī*, *i.e.*, the sacrificial enclosure. Free gifts or liberality outside a sacrifice are not less commendable. The *Chandogya Upaniṣad* (IV, 1, 1-3) illustrates it by a story. A S'ūdra named Janas'ruti Pautrāyaṇa was so munificent a giver for acts of piety and kept an open house for all guests, that his " glory " spread above his dwelling to heaven and flying *haṁsas* were afraid of getting scorched by the glory. But what is given should be one's own ; for, as laid down by the *Taittirīya Sahmita* (VI, 1, 6, 3) " it is a *tapas* only when a person makes a gift of only what he owns " (*Etat khalu vāva tapa ityāhuḥ yaḥ svam dadāti iti*).

Eulogy of Brāhmaṇas

Gifts mentioned in the Veda being fees (*dakṣiṇā*) it naturally follows that the recipients had to be Brāhmaṇas. The *S'atapatha Brāhmaṇa* (II, iii, 14) raises the learned priest to the

[1] ऋत्विजो यशो दक्षिणा हैव तद्यशस्तस्माद्यामस्यै दक्षिणामानयेयुर्न त । इत्सयोऽन्यस्माऽअतिदिशेमेयन्मेदं यश आगंस्तदसयो ऽन्यस्माऽतिदिशानीति श्वो वैव भूते द्व्यहे वा तदात्मन्येवैतद्यशः कृत्वा यदेव तन्नूयति तत्स ददाति हिरण्यं गां वासोऽश्वं वा ॥

(*Ibid.*, p. 1023)

[2] किं नु लोक्यं किमलोक्यमित्यात्मा वै यज्ञस्य यजमानोऽङ्गान्यृत्विजो यत्र वा ऽ आत्मा तदङ्गानि यत्रोऽङ्गानि तदात्मा यदि वा ऽ ऋत्विजो ऽ लोका भवन्त्यलोक उ तर्हि यजमान उभये हि समानलोका भवन्ति दक्षिणासु त्वेन न संवदितव्य॰ संवादे नैव ऽ र्त्विजो ऽ लोका इति ॥

(*Ibid.*, p. 970)

[3] योऽस्याग्निं चिन्वानस्तं दक्षिणाभिर्न राधयेदग्निमस्य वृञ्जीत यो ऽस्याग्निं चिन्वानं दक्षिणाभी राधयेदग्निमेव तत् स्तृणोति ॥

level of gods: "And, verily, there are two kinds of gods: for the gods themselves are assuredly gods; and the priests who have studied and mastered the Veda are the human gods." This is the *s'ruti-pramāṇa* for the declaration in later smṛtis (*e.g. Viṣṇusmṛti*, XIX, 20-22)[1] that the "gods are invisible deities, the Brāhmaṇas are visible deities; the Brāhmaṇa sustains the world; it is by the favour of the Brāhmaṇa that the gods reside in heaven," (since he performs the sacrifices to the gods).

Iṣṭā-Pūrta

As the *dakṣiṇā* is voluntary, not capable of being contracted for in advance without incurring sin, and the *s'rotriya* has a duty to officiate in sacrifices when called upon for his help in that direction, it is not to be regarded as *quid pro quo*. Thereby it approaches closely the later definition of a *dāna*. In Vedic literature, a distinction of gifts in sacrifices and outside the *vedi* (sacrificial enclosure) seems implicit in the expression *iṣṭā-pūrta*, which is used to denote comprehensively the spiritual merit (*puṇya*) accumulated by a man. The merit adheres to a person, and is destroyed or reduced by any wrong or sinful act of commission or omission.

It meets the soul after death in other worlds. In the famous hymn to Yama in the *R. V.* (X, 14) the spirit of the dead man is thus addressed: (8)

> Join thyself to Yama and the Fathers (*pitṛs*);
> Meet there thy reward in highest heaven; (*samayamena iṣṭā-pūrtena parame vyoman*)
> Return to home, free from all imperfection;
> In radiant power gain union with thy body.[2]

[1] देवाः परोक्षदेवाः प्रत्यक्षदेवाः ब्राह्मणाः ।
ब्राह्मणैर्लोका धार्यन्ते ।
ब्राह्मणानां प्रसादेन दिवि तिष्ठन्ति देवताः ।
ब्राह्मणाभिहितं वाक्यं न मिथ्या जायते क्वचित् ॥

[2] Kaegi's *Rig Veda*, trn. Arrowsmith, 1902, p. 70. Griffith's more literal version of the *ṛk* is as follows: "Meet Yama, meet the Fathers, meet the merit of free and ordered acts, in highest heaven. Leave sin and evil, seek anew thy dwelling, and bright with glory wear another body." Griffith translates, *iṣṭa-pūrta* as 'prescribed sacrifices and voluntary good works,' "whose merit is stored up in heaven to be enjoyed on arrival by the spirits of the pious who have performed them." (*Hymns of the Rig Veda*, IV, 1902, p. 129 *note*.)

Literally *iṣṭā* is what is sacrificed, and *pūrta*, what is filled, or completed.[1] To the departed spirit his good acts are to be revealed, having preceded him to heaven :

> What has flowed from purpose, or heart,[2]
> Or what is gathered from mind or sight,
> Follow to the world of good deed,
> Where are the seers, the first-born, the ancient ones.
>
> This I place around thee, O abode, the treasure
> Whom the all-knower hath brought here ;
> After you the lord of the sacrifice will follow ;
> Know ye him in the highest firmament.
>
> Know ye him in the highest firmament,
> O gods associates, ye know his form ;
> When he shall come by the paths god-travelled
> (*patibhiḥ devayānaiḥ*)
> Do ye reveal to him what is sacrificed and what is
> bestowed. (*iṣṭāpūrte kṛṇutādāvirasmai*)
>
> What is offered, what is handed over,
> What is given, the sacrificial fee (*dakṣiṇāḥ*)
> That may Agni Vais'vānara
> Place in the sky among the gods for us.

Iṣṭā-pūrta has efficacy even in this life. It saves one from his enemies ; whether it be one's own or of one's ancestors. (*Atharva Veda*, II, 12, 4 : *iṣṭā-pūrtam avatu naḥ pitṛṇām*). A sixteenth part of the *iṣṭā-pūrta* of a dead person forms a levy by the assessors of Yama, which can be redeemed before-hand, in this life itself by sacrificing a ram. (*Atharva Veda*, III, 29, 1). To lose one's *iṣṭā-pūrta* was a terrible prospect. The eternal and reciprocal union of the sacrificer and his *iṣṭā-pūrta* is what one longs for and prays to Agni for (*Vājasaneya Samhita*, XV, 54 : *Udbudhyasvāgne prati jāgṛhi tvam-iṣṭāpūrte saṁsṛjethāmayam ca.*). A false reply to an enquiry destroys, according to the *Mahābhārata* (cited by the *S'abdakalpadruma*), the *iṣṭā-pūrta* of

[1] Keith, *Veda of the Black Yajus School*, I, 1914, p. 100, *n.*, explains *pūrtin* as 'one who has satisfied the priests'.

[2] Keith's trn. *op. cit.* p. 475 (Vol. II).

seven generations preceding and following the sinner. Unrestrained evil (*caurakarma*) in a kingdom destroys the king's *iṣṭā-pūrta*, according to the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (18, 6).[1] A sin of omission, like the failure to feed a Brāhmaṇa guest, "destroys (the offender's) hopes (*āśā*) and expectations (*pratīkṣā*), his possessions, his righteousness (*sūnṛta*) his *iṣṭā-pūrta* and all his sons and cattle", according to the *Kāṭhakopaniṣad* (I, i, 8).[2]

Manusmṛti (IV, 227)[3] includes both *iṣṭā* and *pūrta* under *dāna*, when it lays down that "one should, according to his means (*śaktitaḥ*) discharge the duty of gifts (*dāna-dharma niṣeveta*), which consists in *iṣṭā* and *pūrta*, after obtaining a suitable recipient (*pātram āsādya*) and with a joyous mind (*paritusṭena bhāvena*)." Medhātithi explains the terms thus: "*Iṣṭam* is what is performed within the bounds of the sacrificial enclosure (*antarvedi*), like a sacrifice; *pūrtam* is what is done outside these limits, like presents for unseen benefits) *adṛṣṭār-tham*)" (IV, 226). The definition limits the use of the terms to cases of charity in which an invisible benefit alone accrues. In a passage ascribed to the *Mahābhārata* by Aparārka (p. 290) *iṣṭam* comprehends what is offered to the single (domestic) fire, the triple (śrauta) fire and whatever is given as a gift within the sacrificial enclosure (*antarvedyām ca yad-dānam*), while *pūrtam* refers to the dedication of wells, large and small (*vāpi-kūpa*), tanks, temples, gardens and the giving of cooked food (*anna-pradānam*).[4] The sense of terms is illustrated and extended in

[1] इष्टापूर्त्तविनाशाय तद्राज्ञश्चौरकर्मणः ।
यद्यन्यैः पाल्यते लोकस्तद्भृत्यन्तरसंश्रितः ॥

[2] वैश्वानरः प्रविशति अतिथिर्ब्राह्मणो गृहान् ।
तस्यैता॰ शान्तिं कुर्वन्ति हर वैवस्वतोदकम् ॥
आशाप्रतीक्षे संगत॰ सूनृतां चेष्टापूर्ते पुत्रपशूंश्च सर्वान् ।
एतद्वृङ्क्ते पुरुषस्याल्पमेधसो यस्यानशनन्वसति ब्राह्मणो गृहे ॥

[3] श्रद्धयेष्टं च पूर्तं च नित्यं कुर्यादतन्द्रितः ।
श्रद्धाकृते ह्यक्षये ते भवतः स्वागतैर्धनैः ॥
दानधर्मं निषेवेत नित्यैष्टिकपौर्तिकम् ।
परितुष्टेन भावेन पात्रमासाद्य शक्तितः ॥

[4] एकाग्निकर्म हवनं त्रेतायां यच्च हूयते ।
अन्तर्वेद्यां च यद्दानमिष्टमित्यभिधीयते ॥

two verses, which are attributed in the *Malamasatatva* of Raghunandana to Jatūkarṇya, one of which is identical with that from the *Mahabhārata* illustrating the meaning of *purta*. The second half of the first of the two verses is identical with the first half of five half-verses cited as from Nārada by Apararka; it says that honoring a guest (*i.e.* feeding him with *daksina*) and *vais'vadeva* sacrifice constitute *istam*. Jatukarṇya adds to these two the *agnihotra*, austerity (*tapas*), truth (*satyam*) and the upkeep of the Veda (*vedanam ca paripalanam*). For the *ista* the right to perform (*adhikāra*) rests only with the regenerate varṇas (*dvijati*), while all, including the S'udra and women, have the capacity, and the *duty* to make *purta* gifts. Wealth has its obligations as well as its privileges. The duty to give lies on every one with means to do so. The s'loka cited by Aparārka from Vṛddha-Vasistha (p. 199) that "the two who could be unceremoniously drowned, after tying stones round their necks, are the rich man who will not give, and the poor man who is not austere" states rhetorically the accepted view, on which the entire edifice of *Dāna-dharma* is built.

EVOLUTION OF THE DANA DOCTRINES

The doctrine of Gifts has thus a long history. Belief that what is given away in this life is a means of happiness in the next is both ancient and universal. Faith in the efficacy of the great sacrifices naturally magnified the value of the priests whose help was necessary for the successful and proper performance of the sacrifices. The *daksina* of the priest was like the offerings made into the fire for the gods, and for the offerings in the sacrifice. In all three cases, the offering was parted with by the sacrificer, whose property in it ceased with the act. In an offering to the sacred fire as well as in the great sacrifices, prayer and supplication to the deities preceded the act of libation. An attitude of pious devotion was essential to their success. Analogy

वापीकूपतडागानि देवतायतनानि च ।
अन्नप्रदानमारामः पूर्तमित्यभिधीयते ॥

[1] It is ascribed also to Bṛhaspati:
द्वावेवाप्सु प्रवेष्टव्यौ गले बद्ध्वा महाशिलाम् ।
धनवन्तमदातारं दरिद्रं चातपस्विनम् ॥

transferred these features to gifts, whether made in sacrifices or ceremonies like the *s'rāddha*, and the act of giving had to be preceded by ceremonious homage to the donee and a proper frame of devout belief in the donor. For the efficacy of a *homa* (domestic sacrifice) or a *yāga*, the necessary articles and wealth had to be owned by the *kartā* (sacrificer) and to have been acquired in righteous way. The fruitfulness of a gift (*dāna*) was made to depend on similar pre-requisites. The difference between *dakṣiṇā* and *dāna* melted away, when their common elements, *viz.* non-contractual character, aim of an invisible spiritual benefit (*apūrva*, *adṛṣṭaphala*), sacrificial basis and ritualistic formalities, were visualised. The recognition is old. In the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (X, 63, i) it is declared : "Dāna is the armour (*varūtha*) of the sacrifice. In the world of guerdon (*dakṣiṇā-loke*) all beings subsist on the giver. By gifts (*dānena*) evil spirits are driven away. By *dāna* those who hate become friends. Everything rests on *dāna*. Therefore *dāna* is said to be the best." The psychological association of charity (*dāna*) with restraint (*dama*) and compassion (*dayā*) is behind the injunction of Prajapati to gods, men and *asuras*, in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (V, 2, 3) : "Be subdued. Give (gifts). Be merciful. Therefore let this triple truth be taught : *Damam*, *Dānam* and *Dayā*."[1]

GROWTH OF THE LITERATURE OF DĀNA

The importance of *Dāna* grew with the rise of non-Kṣatriya dynasties, and the increasing opulence of devout S'ūdras, to whom the way of *yāga* was not open. Even otherwise, the equilibrium in a society in which the paramount duties of spiritual leadership and education rested on a small section of the people, which was bound to render its services without demanding remuneration, while economic and political influence as well as affluence went to the other sections, necessitated liberality being inculcated as a *religious* duty, when the beneficiaries would be those of this

[1] Cited by the *Vīramitrodaya*, Dānaprakās'a, fol. 9 as from *Kaṇvas'ākhā*. *Rangarāmānuja* explains thus : *Dāntā bhavata, dānam kuruta, dayām kuruta iti*, p. 267 ed. Ānandās'rama, 1911.

The same passage is cited by *Madanapradīpa*, fol. 9 as from *Satapatha-brahmaṇa* (sic).

dedicated class. Expediency as much as faith must have strengthened the trend to magnify the virtue of charity, especially towards the class devoted to learning and spirituality. The idea that the gods are pleased when gifts are made leads to the further idea that particular types of gifts, given in particular ways are specially acceptable to particular divinties. Similarly, the old idea that an unseen good of an enduring character that survives the bodily dissolution of the doer, and adheres to him as a beneficial influence in other lives, gives place to the idea that some kinds of gifts, made in certain places and on certain occasions, lead the donor after death to particular heavens. While the *summum bonum* of the intellectual continues to be the conquest of *karma* and rebirth, to men of ordinary mould, life in a paradise, (one of the many heavens or *loka* of Paurāṇic Hinduism) has a more direct and effective appeal. Purāṇic literature worked out in detail the connection between gifts and such paradisaical lives, and stressed the ritualistic and magical accompaniments of donation. Systematisation, classification and analogy were allowed free play in the evolution of an extensive *dāna-dharma*, which strayed more and more from the Vedic belief in *yāga*, *homa* and *iṣtā-pūrta*, and established concrete relations between certain types of ornate gifts and their reactions on the fortunes of the donors both in this life and after death. The possibilities of elaboration are exploited by the Purāṇas and the Upa-purāṇas as well as by Tantric works. Simple charity, inspired by compassion and universal benevolence, which was held out by Buddhism as an ethical means of release from the bondage of *samsāra* (re-incarnation) was unable to hold its own against the attractions of ornate *dāna* held out in Purāṇic literature. Though the smṛtis forbade gifts made for ostentation, yet to kings of new dynasties, often of dubious *varṇa*, the performance of the more expensive gifts, like that of the great *yāgas*, had a powerful attraction. The pageantry of splendid gifts, claiming to be made in accordance with śāstras, had great value to new dynasts. The voice of the philosopher [1] and the passionate denunciations of the followers of *Bhakti-mārga* are

[1] *e. g. Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, I, ii, 10: "Considering *iṣṭa-pūrta* as the best, these fools nothing higher, and they re-enter the world having enjoyed their reward in paradise."

powerless against the elaborated *Dana-dharma*, which is elucidated in digests and special treatises of growing bulk.

Its Imposing Size

The literature of *Dana* even in its surviving form is of imposing extent. A great part of the *Anus'asanaparva* of the *Mahabharata* (chs. 57-99) is devoted to it, while topics connected with *dana* are dealt with in other *parvas*. Among the *mahapuranas*, the following deal with the subject: *Agnipurana* (chs. 209-213); *Bhavisya*, IV, 150 ff.; *Brahma*, 109 (specially on *annadāna*); *Brahma-vaivarta*, Prakrti-khanda, 27; *Garuda*, 51; *Kurma*, Uttarardha, 26; *Linga*, Uttarardha, 28, *mahadanas*; *Matsya*, chs. 81-91, 205-206, 274-289; *Narada*, Purvardha, 19 and 31, and Uttarārdha, 41-42; *Padma*, Ādi., 57, Bhūmi., 39-40, 94, Brahma., 24, Sṛṣṭi., 45, and 75, Uttara., 27, 28, and 33; *Skanda*, I, 2, III, 2. 34, VII, 1, 5 and 208; *Varāha*, 99-111. There are considerations of *Utsarga* and *Pratistha* in the *Agni*, (38-106) *Bhaviṣya*, II, *Garuda*, 45-48, *Narada*, I, 13, *Paḍma*, (Uttara, 122, 127, and 28, S'rsti, 54-56), *Siva*, 11.

The above references, which are taken from Mr. Kane's *History of Dharmas'astra*, I, 1930, pp. 159-167, refer only to *printed* Puranas. Among these, Laksmidhara cites only the following major Puranas: *Padma*, *Brahma*, *Bhavisya*, *Matsya*, *Varaha* and *Skanda*. He also quotes the *Vayu-purana* and the *Markandeya-purana*, besides the following Upa-puranas: *Aditya-purana* (unprinted), *Kalika-purana*, *Devipurana*, *Nandipurana* (known only from quotations mostly having their source in the *Dana-Kalpataru* itself), *Narasimhapurāṇa* and *Vamanapurana*. In many cases the texts of the printed works do not give the passages quoted, thereby raising a presumption of their authenticity in their present form.[1] A similar deduction about the omitted Puraṇas is barred by Laksmīdhara's declaration that he avoided repetition wherever possible. One of the subsidiary uses of the publication of the *Krtya-Kalpataru* will be the help it will render in the preparation of pure texts of the Puranas.

[1] This is so with the editions of *Devipurāna* printed at Calcutta and Bombay and the Bombay editions of *Brahmapurāna*.

POST-KALPATARU LITERATURE OF DĀNA

There is no reason to believe that Lakṣmīdhara had any predecessors in the treatment of *dāna* in a special treatise. The more considerable works on *Dāna-dharma* written after his time seem to be based ultimately on his treatise. The *Bhūpāla-paddhati*, which is cited by Caṇḍes'vara in *Dānaratnākara* several times, is probably a section of the work named *Bhūpālasamuccaya*, quoted by him in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (p. 205) under that name, or as *Bhūpāla Kṛtya-samuccaya* (pp. 278, 313, 496), and it *may* be a lost work of Bhoja Bhūpāla, who is named in the same work (p. 58). The *Dānasāgara*, the first considerable treatise on *dāna* after the *Kalpataru*, was written in 1168 A.D. It is stated, by Raghunandana with great approximation to probability, as really composed by Aniruddha, his *purohita*, and the author of *Pitṛdayitā* and *Hāralatā*. The very full treatment of *prayoga-mantras*, arranged for each vedic *s'ākhā* separately, which is the notable improvement on the *Dānakalpataru* made by the *Dānasāgara*, is obviously the contribution of a *vaidīka* like Aniruddha. It may be noted that Ballāla Sena takes pride in the introductory verses prefixed to the *Dānasāgara* in describing himself as the disciple of Aniruddha. (*Inf.* p. 338, sl. 4; *Vṛtrāreriva Goṣpatir narapaterasyāniruddho guruḥ*). Nearly a hundred years later, Hemādri contributed to his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, an elaborate section on Dāna (*Dāna-Kaṇḍa*). It is the largest existing treatise on the subject. How thoroughly it absorbed, even to the extent of the appropriation of verbal explanations and comments of the *Dānakalpataru* will be seen from my footnotes in which such obligations are noticed. Caṇḍes'vara's *Dānaratnākara* is a much shorter work, and it must have been composed after his *Kṛtyaratnākara* to which a reference is made in the *pratijñā*, and probably after the *Vyavahāra*, *S'uddhi*, *Vivāda* and *Gṛhastha Ratnākaras*, if the concluding verse of the *Dānaratnākara*, in which they are named, is authentic (p. 548). He must have composed it before the *Kṛtyacintāmaṇi*, *Dāna-vākyāvali*, and the *Rājanītiratnākara*, the other works composed by him. It may be taken that the *Dānaratnākara* was composed before 1300 A.D., *i.e.*, a generation later than Hemādri's immense digest, to which Caṇḍes'vara's work contains no reference. The

close proximity in age between the two compilers might explain the omission. Even more directly than Hemādri, Caṇḍes'vara builds his book around the core of Lakṣmīdhara's treatise on *dāna*. As against 22 chapters of *Dānakalpataru*, the *Dānarat-nākara* has 29. Caṇḍes'vara draws upon Bhūpāla and even more on Ballāla Sena, to supplement his borrowings from Lakṣmīdhara. He cites some more Purāṇas than his original, *viz*. *Agni*, *Ādi*, *Kūrma*, *Garuḍa*, *Nāradīya*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Viṣṇu*, *Liṅga*, *Sāmba*, and *S'iva*. He also quotes *Pāñcarātra* and *Dars'ana* works. The additions he has made are obviously of passages which must have been available to Lakṣmīdhara who had rejected them. In doctrine and statement, he adds little to the *Dānakalpataru*, in spite of his parade of wider reading. Caṇḍes'vara's cousin Rāmadatta wrote in the first quarter of the 14th century a *Dānapaddhati*, dealing with the 16 *mahādānas*. In Mithila the subject continued to attract writers, and Dr. Jayaswal's "Catalogue of Smṛti MSS. in Mithila" mentions several works like *Dānavākyāvali* of Vidyāpati Ṭhakur (c. 1425 A.D.) and a work of the same name by his patron Queen Dhīramati. A work named *Dānārṇava* was also composed by command of this queen. The *Mahadānanirṇaya* of the renowned Maithila-*smārta* Vācas-Mis'ra exists in a manuscript in Nepal bearing a date equal to A.D. 1511, and the book itself must have been composed forty or fifty years atleast earlier. (Kane, I, p. 405).

In the Baroda Oriental Institute there exists a treatise on *dāna* named *Aghabāḍava* or *Dānasāra* (MS. No. 7129 C) which claims to be the work of Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa, the real author of *Madnapārijāta*, compiled under the patronage of Madanapāla, whose date is placed by Mr. Kane (I, p. 389) between 1360 and 1390 A.D. The colophon is in places almost identical with verses in *Madanapārijāta*, and about the authenticity of its being a composition of Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa there can be no doubt. The reputation of its author will justify a closer examination of this hitherto unrecognised work of Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa.[1]

[1] My attention was drawn to this work four years ago by Dr. V. Raghavan of the *Catalogus Catalagorum* department of the University of Madras. The colophon of *Aghabaḍava* which he has supplied me leaves no doubt of the identity of the author of this treatise on *Dāna* and the famous author of the *Subodhini* and the *Madana-parijata*. Mr. Kane who had apparently not seen the manuscript, naturally records the authorship of the *Aghabaḍava* and the *Subodhini* as of two different persons (*op. cit*. p. 742)

The great digest *Madanaratna-pradipa* has a section devoted to *Dana*, named *Dānavivekod-dyota* which should have been composed, according to Mr. Kane (*op. cit.* p. 393) between 1425-1450 A.D. An examination of its contents shows that, like other digests on *dāna*, it has fully exploited the *Dāna-Kalpataru*, adding to it additional citations from Purāṇas etc., which Lakṣmidhara had discarded. It mentions the *Kalpataru* by name two or three times, but its obligations to the earlier work are clear even without a formal citation. It runs in a transcript made from a MS. in the Ānandās'rama at Poona, to 1500 quarto pages.[1] Among previous works mentioned by name are the works of Bhupala, the *Kalpataru*, the *Ratnākara*, the *Dāna-sāgara* (to which many of its *prayogas* may be traced), the *Dāna-viveka* (which is also cited by Hemādri) and the opinion of *Cintāmaṇi-kāra*. The last name is intriguing. Vācaspati Mis'ra's works have names ending with "cintāmaṇi." If it is Vācaspati who is alluded to under this designation, the citation will run against the dates of Madanasimha (A.D. 1425-1450) and of Vācaspati (c. 1450 A.D.) now accepted. The only work of this great Maithila on *Dāna*, which is known is the *Mahādāna-nirṇaya*, and why its author should be called "Cintāmaṇikāra" will still remain to be explained. We know of no other writer prior to Madanasimha to whom this designation would apply.

The *Madanaratna-pradipa* on *Dāna* illustrates the way in which a digest grows like an ice-ball. It contains nothing new on the theory of *Dāna*, which might add to what we find in the *Kalpataru*. Its *prayogas* are not better or fuller or clearer than those of *Dānasāgara*. But, on such matters as the erection of kuṇḍas or pavilions etc., it dilates and quotes extensively from works on *S'ilpas'āstra*, like *Vāstus'āstra*, *Vis'vambhara-Vāstu-s'āstra* (p. 178), *Mayadīpika* (p. 264), (p. 185), *Vis'vakarmīya* (p. 220) and *Varāhasamhita i.e.*, the *Bṛhatsamhitā* of Varāha-mihira (p. 173). It quotes works on astrology for proper moments for gifts, like the *Jyotis'-s'āstra* (p. 108), *Jyotir-Parās'ara*, (p. 111), and *Siddhānta-s'ekhara* (p. 189), *Brahma-yāmala* (p. 231), *Utpala-parimala* (p. 241), and *Siddhānta-samhitā* (p. 263). Works on S'aiva and Vaiṣṇava Āgama like *S'ivadharmottara* (p. 114), *Mūlāgama* (p. 190), *S'āradātilaka* (p. 198), *Kāmikāgama*

[1] Now in the Adyar Library, Madras.

(p. 199), *Prathamāgama* (p. 212), *Pingalāgama* (p. 213), *Kālottara* (p. 212), *Svāyambhuvāgama* (p. 217), *Lalitā-vijaya* (p. 645) and *Pāñcarātra* (p. 753) are freely cited. The way in which these works are brought in shows the growing artificiality of the treatment of *Dāna*, the magical rites with which the old simple donative offerings were gradually smothered, and the atmosphere of mystery with which the giving of gifts began to be shrouded. By the end of the fifteenth century A.D. this transformation was complete.

The contribution of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to *Dāna* lore consists in the systematisation of the doctrine and ritual, the application of *Mīmāmsa* rules, of which the new writers, like Lakṣmīdhara and the old *bhāṣyakāras* were masters, and attempts to separate the more ornate *dānas* from the less. The emulation to excel older writers in comprehensiveness also is in evidence in writers like Mitra Mis'ra, the author of the biggest extant digest, the *Vīramitrodaya*. There is a tendency to hark back to older authorities like the *Kalpataru* and *the Pārijāta*, in preference to the intervening writers. Smaller compendia (like Divākara's *Dānacandrikā*, c. 1675 A. D., are popular.[1] When ambitious princes wish to commemorate their achievements by splendid coronations and cermonial gifts, conforming to the rules laid down for *Mahādānas*, special heirophants like the celebrated Gāgā Bhaṭṭa or Vis'ves'vara Bhaṭṭa are engaged, as he was for the coronation and allied ceremonies of S'ivāji (A. D. 1676). Greater importance is attached than before to gifts at sacred *tīrthas*, and on special occasions. *Pūrta* gains precedence over *iṣṭa*, and gifts to individuals become not more important than dedications for public purposes, which suit better the changing spirit of the times. Scholars no more concern themselves with elaborating the rules for gifts which were becoming obsolete. The special treatises on

[1] The *Dānacandrikā* contains details of an astonishingly large number of gifts. Its author Divākara was the *dauhitra* of Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, father of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa. Mr. Kane fixes his literary activity between 1620 and 1670 A.D. Among writers or works cited by him are the *Kalpataru* (p. 39), Vijñānes'vara (p. 97), *Smṛtyarthasāra* of Sridhara (p. 101), Hemādri (pp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18, 23, 39, 46, 47, 50, 54, 55, 69, 82, 83, 84 and 97), Ṭakkur (Vidyāpati, *Madanaratna*, pp. 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 36, 50), *Mahārṇava* (p. 96), *Karmavipākasāra* (p. 67), *Mayūkha* (p. 14, 29), *Prayogaratna* (p. 36), *Dānaviveka* (p. 31) and *Ṣaṭ-triṃs'anmata* (p. 97). Neither Caṇḍes'vara's work on *Dāna*, nor Mitramis'ra's is referred to.

Dāna of the early seventeenth century,[1] which reflected the love of comprehension and vast erudition of the last of the distinguished *nibandha-kāras* like Mitra Misra, Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha and his cousin Kamalākara, become works of reference permanently occupying the upper shelves of libraries. The newer writers even on *Dāna*, like Govindānanda concern themselves only with the *dānas* which have uses in the life of the average man. The legal aspects of gifts are more studied than their ritualistic and mystic aspects. *Dāna* comes to occupy a minor place in the popular manuals of daily duties (*āhnika*).[2] Its study partakes more the character of an antiquarian exercise than the cultivation of a subject of vivid and widespread interest. Its academic use is in its furnishing the background for the donative inscriptions, which virtually monopolise the extant epigraphic material.

ANALYSIS OF DĀNA-DHARMA

We may now proceed to state briefly the relevant teachings of *Dāna-dharma* as set forth in Lakṣmidhara's primary work, and as developed by his major successors.

THE PRAISE OF DĀNA

Lakṣmīdhara, after indicating the scope and subject-matter of his book in the *viṣaya-nirdes'aḥ* or *pratijṇā* (pp. 1-2) proceeds to discuss the nature of *Dāna*. Writers who followed him have usually begun with an eulogy of gifts, in which they show its importance (*e.g. Dānaprakās'a*, fol. 8-16). Caṇḍes'vara (p. 3) simply cites Manu's injunctions (I, 86, and IV, 227) to practise Dāna as the chief virtue of Kaliyuga, in suitable charitable works (*pūrta*) and sacrifices (*Iṣṭa*).

[1] Nilakaṇṭha's *Dānamayūkha* has been printed. He departs from the practice of older writers in separating *utsarga* (the old *pūrta*) and *pratiṣṭha*, which partially covered the ground of *pūrta*, from *Dāna*, and devotes special sections to each of the three. The *Dāna-kamalākara* of Kāmalākara is on the same model, is even larger and is unprinted. I have used a transcript made, under my supervision for the Adyar Library. The *Dāna-prakās'a* of Mitra Mis'ra, the last of a line of illustrious treatises, is also unprinted, and I have used a transcript made by me for the Adyar Library.

[2] The South Indian *smārtas* like Hārita Venkaṭācārya, the author of *Smṛti-ratnākara* and Vaidyanātha Dīkṣita, the author of *Smṛtimuktāphala*, do not concern themselves much with *Dāna*, except so far as it comes within *āhnika*, *s'rāddha*, *prāyascitta*, and *as'auca*. Kings had Hemādri,

The duty is enjoined briefly on p. 10. Few of the later writers who cite Vedic praises of gifts refer to the famous *ḍānastutis*, possibly from regarding them as related to *dakṣiṇā* rather than *dāna*. The *Vīramitrodaya* cites (following the *Madana-pradīpa*) a long passage from the *Mahābhārata* (fol. 13-14) on famous royal donors. The important duty of gifts is shown by imprecations against those who say: " Do not give " when one is about to make a gift, or perform a sacrifice (p. 24). As there is no special merit in merely discharging an ordinary duty, taking credit for a gift is sinful. Accordingly, following Manu (IV, 237), the advertisement of a gift is condemned as likely to weaken its beneficial effects (p. 24). On the same ground, gifts have to be given without solicitation (p. 4). Reciprocal gifts are not gifts; they are sinful (p. 4). The destiny of wealth is to be acquired righteously and developed and distributed in gifts to deserving persons (p. 4).

NATURE OF DĀNA (DĀNASVARŪPAM)

A real gift (*dharma-dāna*) is made without expectation of a return, it is given to one who is indicated as a proper recipient by the śāstras (*udite pātre*), and it is given freely and with devotion (p. 5). Donations made out of fear, cupidity, love, shame, and pleasurable impulse, are miscalled *Dāna* (p. 6). The six elements of a gift are the donor, the donee. a devout frame of mind in both, the object to be given, time and place. The old idea that a gift entails a reduction of the merit (*puṇya*) of the recipient, and must be balanced by (1) the possession of adequate acquired spirituality and merit and (2) by penance, is behind the rules defining the high qualities which the perfect donee and donor should have. One who suffers from diseases due to bad *karma* in previous births (*pāpa-rogī*) is not a person from whom one can safely take a gift; nor one who follows a bad life or calling; nor one who is afflicted with misfortune (p. 6). A gift wrongly made might not only fail to attain its invisible good effect (*adṛṣṭa-phala*) but have either no effect or lead to an evil recoil on the donor (p. 7). Gifts are of four classes: of permanent good effect, of daily benefit, of affection, of expediency (p. 8). Gifts may be made with or without

the sacred fire. Certain articles constitute the best, some of the middling and others bad gifts. To donate what has been unlawfully acquired is bound to result only in evil (p. 9). What is given or promised can not be taken back (p. 11). Give respectfully, and receive a gift with honor (p. 12). The decadence of our age is shown by donees coming voluntarily for gifts (p. 13). A devout spirit corrects errors in gift-ritual (p. 14). All gifts must be made by pouring water (p. 14). To give is the test of the good householder (p. 15). Give secretly (p. 15) ; it is the best way.

Definition of Gift

Laksmidhara omits a definition of *Dana*, contenting himself with a general indication. As it enters into litigation as well as *dharma*, later writers have explored its scope. The Mimamsa definition of a gift is that it begins with the relinquishment of ownership by the giver and ends with the acquisition of ownership by the recipient. Under this definition, acceptance, *pratigraha*, is necessary for completing a gift. A mere offer to give might fail to find a response in a willingness to accept. Thus, in a formal gift, the offer is made to a person, as in the gift of a *kanya*, the offer is permitted by the donee saying, "Give" (*dadasva*), the gift is then made in the form prescribed, and completed by the pouring of water. The invisible effect (*apūrva, adṛsta*) is started by the offer, but the obligation lies on the donor to complete the gift, if he should get the beneficial invisible effect. In the case of a gift dedicated to an absent person, who is the mentally elected donee, if the donor pours water on water, his ownership is terminated, and he can not recall the gift ; but, till it is taken over by the intended donee, the latter does not acquire the disability (spiritual) of receiving a gift (*na doṣabhāk*). To get the full effect, the donor must protect the gift till it is taken over by the donee. On this principle, *dāna* is distinguished from *yaga* and *homa*, as in the latter there is no acceptance of the offering or libation by the deity intended as recipient. In this view, a *pratistha* or dedication or a *purta*

He should do so, as the sacrificer has to see that the offering meant for the fire is not released till it falls into the fire :

अनन्युद्देशात्यक्त पुरोडाशादाविव ।

or a gift for a public purpose of a tank, garden etc. will not rightly come under *dāna*. And as a gift has to be made, with proper forms, and with a *dakṣiṇā* (guerdon), free teaching can be called *vidyā-dāna* only by analogy (*guṇa-dāna*), as the teacher does not give a fee to the pupil before imparting instruction to him free. Nor will the gift of a son in adoption, and gifts of affection (*kāma-dāna*) be real *dāna*. Nīlakaṇṭha, who begins with this discussion, would not dismiss the gifts, excepting the *dharma-dāna*, as not in the category, by applying the fiction (as in the fiction of purchasing *soma* for a sacrifice, when it is really provided by the sacrificer to the person supposed to sell it to the sacrificer) of conformity. But, he excludes from his treatment of *dāna* dedications for public purposes. Lakṣmīdhara, though a Mīmāṃsaka, discards the question definition, contents himself with an indication of the rough constituents of *dāna*, following Devala, and treats as *dāna* whatever conforms to the prescribed requirements as regards the qualities of giver and recipient, the objects of the gifts, and due conformity to prescribed procedure. *Utsaraga* (dedication) comes within the scope of his treatment of *dāna*, and his position approximates *dāna* to *homa* and *yāga*, and brings it into line with ancient usage.[1] This is in conformity with what Govindānanda states as the feature commonly associated with *dāna*, *viz.* relinquishment which aims at the creation of ownership in the person contemplated (*Uddes'yagatasvāmitvajanakastyāgo dānam*)[2]. But as mere relinquishment leading to the generation of ownership in another of the object relinquished may bring a sale within the definition, qualifying words have to be used to restrict the use of *dāna* to correct cases of gifts, as laid down in the s'āstras. Accordingly Govindānanda modifies the old definition by additional clauses thus: "*Dāna* is the relinquishment of ownership in an object, in ways laid down by the s'āstras, following the giving and acceptance of the object in the manner laid down by the s'āstras."[3] Under this definition

[1] *Dana-Kriyā-Kaumudi*, p. 124 :

वेदबोधितत्यागस्य यागो दानं होमो वा इति त्रितयान्यतरनियमात् सर्वसत्वसम्प्रदानक-कूपवाप्याद्युत्सर्गस्य ।

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 2. शास्त्रोक्तसंप्रदानस्वीकारसंपादकः शास्त्रोक्तप्रकारो द्रव्यत्यागो दानमिति वैधदानलक्षणमायतम् ॥

failure to conform to the procedure laid down will invalidate the claim of a transfer to be deemed a gift (*dāna*). Thus, according to the *Dānaratnākara*, a *dāna* can not be made after the donor has taken his food.[1] If this condition is not complied with, a *dāna* will be no *dāna*, as it will not conform to ways laid down by the s'āstras. The mental attitude is important to determine whether a transfer is a *dāna* or not. Devala, cited by Lakṣmīdhara, insists on the donor not expecting a return (*anavekṣya prayojanam*) for the gift as essential. Thus, wedding and birthday presents which are nowadays given, in the confidence that similar presents will be received from the recipients by the donor later on in his turn, will violate this condition of *dāna*, which of course bars a sale, open or disguised, from inclusion in the category. A spiritual return (*adṛṣṭa prayojanam*) is not, however, barred as an expectation which would invalidate the gift: for, what is to be avoided is the expectation of some advantage or benefit from the person who receives the gift, and not what arises from the act of donation in accordance with the s'āstras.

PRATIGRAHA

It has been pointed out that while *yāga, homa and dāna* have, as pointed out by S'abara-svāmin (IV, 2, 28), a common element in 'offering', involving relinquishment of ownership, only in *dāna* is the thing actually taken away by the recipient. In *yāga* and *homa* this is wanting in a literal sense, though it is presumed that what is offered to a deity or the fire is accepted and taken over, when the ceremony is properly done, as in the mere verbal surrendership of ownership to the deity in *yāga*. following prescribed rites, and the thing offered in a *homa* is thrown into a prescribed receptacle, such as water or the fire.[2] The formal taking over is *pratigraha*, which, in the case of a human donee is not to be automatically presumed. The *pratigraha*, or taking over, entails both a mental attitude as well as

[1] p. 7. अदृष्टमश्नुते दानं भुक्त्वा दानं न दृश्यते ।
पुनरागमनं नास्ति तस्य दानमनर्थकम् ॥
भोजनानन्तरं दानं क्वचिन्न दृश्यते । पुनरतिफलद्वारागमनं पुन नास्ति । अत एव तदनर्थकं फलशून्यत्वादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] *S'abara-bhaṣya*, Trn. G. Jha, II, 1934, p. 785.

physical acts. The former [1] consists, as pointed out by Medhātithi (*Manu*, IV, 5), in the donee's faith that by his accepting the thing given the donor will obtain some spiritual merit (*puṇya*) or invisible benefit (*adṛṣṭam*). The latter comprise the recitation by the donee of certain prescribed *mantras* [1] (such as *devasya tvā*, and the taking over of the object given away in the manner prescribed ; *e.g.* a cow by the tail, an elephant by the trunk, a horse by its mane, a *dāsī* by touching her head etc. Want of formal *pratigraha*, in any way, makes a gift incomplete, viewed as *dāna.* Almsgiving, casual presents to relations, tips to servants, will not be *dāna.*[1] General poor feeding will not be *dāna*, though usually alluded to by analogy as *annadāna.*

A verse of the *Agnipurāṇa* is quoted by Govindānanda for instance, which extols the limitless reach of a *dāna* by describing how, after mentally deciding upon a recipient of a gift, the giver can complete the gift, by pouring water (as a mark of renunciation of ownership) on the ground ; but it is explained away by pointing out that if by any chance the intended donee does not get possession of the thing, the *dāna* has not fructified, by being left incomplete.[2] The verse is cited in a slightly different form by Nīlakaṇṭha, so as to convey the same sense of incompleteness, only so far as the donee is concerned : " If a donor, after determining mentally the person to whom the gift is made, pours water on water, then he obtains the fruit of the action, while the (intended) donee does not acquire the sin of acceptance."[3]

A third condition of a correct *pratigraha* is that in the formula with which the donation is made the name of the particular deity to whom the object donated is sacred must be mentioned. The recital of the deity's name corresponds to the indication of the name of the *ṛṣi* and *chandas* in the formula preceding the repetition of a Vedic *mantra.* When, specific results, besides the unseen benefit (*adṛṣṭa-phala*), are indicated in śāstras for any gifts validly made, the specification of such

[1] नैव ग्रहणमात्रं प्रतिग्रहः । अदृष्टबुद्ध्या दीयमानं मन्त्रपूर्वं गृह्णतः 'प्रतिग्रहो' भवति । न च भैक्षे 'देवस्य त्वादि' मन्त्रोच्चारणमस्ति । न च प्रत्याविना दानग्रहणे ॥ (ed. Jha, I, p. 329)

[2] This is repeated and explained away in a lengthy note by *Viramitrodaya* also, I, fol. 35-38. See also *Dānakriyākaumudi*, p. 3.

[3] *Dānamayūkha*, p. 2.

aims is an ingredient of the formula of donation. Other details of the actual ceremony of *dāna* are laid down and are to be regarded as essential to validity of a gift ; *e.g.*, the presentation of a *dakṣiṇā* to the donee, seating the donee so as to make him face west, the donor facing east, except for *kanyādāna*, for which the donee is seated facing east. The *dravyadevatas* are named, following a purāṇa (*e.g.*, *Viṣṇudharmottara*) in the later works on *dāna* like *Dānamayūkha* (pp. 11, 13). *Dānakriyā-kaumudī* (pp. 5-7).[1]

Dāna is a religious act. It has to be done with scrupulous regard to the procedure prescribed, not only for all *dānas*, but the procedure indicated for individual *dānas*. The donor is assisted by a *purohita*, learned in the procedure, and will not therefore ordinarily go wrong. The recipient has an obligation not less onerous, and in fact more onerous. Fault in procedure will, from the standpoint of the giver only make him lose the expected benefit. But a defect in procedure will be serious to the donee (*pratigrahī*), since every *dāna* carries with it a load of demerit, which will be intensified by errors in procedure, such as the omission of the correct *mantras*, or use of wrong *mantras*, or omission of some formulæ. Such results may be calamitous to the donee.[2] This is why *Manusmṛti* (IV, 187) contains this warning : " Without a correct knowledge of the rules prescribed by the sacred law for the acceptance of gifts, a wise man should not accept anything, even if he is pining (at the time) with hunger." [3] The recipient of a gift must firstly possess the learning and spirituality, when will enable him to get over the bad effects of the acceptance of a *dāna*, and secondly, he must perform the penances (*prāyaścitta*) enjoined for the acceptance of gifts generally and specifically. This why, according to Manu (IV, 191) " an ignorant person should be afraid of accepting any presents ; for by reason of (even) a very small (gift, which he accepts), he, as a fool, sinks into hell, as a cow sinks into a morass." [4] Manu indicates the evils which will follow acceptance of particular gifts, without either the capacity to merit them and

[1] See also *Viramitrodaya*, fol. 154-155. [2] He may become a *Brahmarakṣas*.

[3] न द्रव्याणामविज्ञाय विधिं धर्म्यं प्रतिग्रहे ।
प्राज्ञः प्रतिग्रहं कुर्यादवसीदन्नपि क्षुधा ॥
तस्मादविद्वान् बिभियाद्यस्मात्तस्मात्प्रतिग्रहात् ।
स्वल्पकेनाप्यविद्वान् हि पङ्के गौरिव सीदति ॥

get over their bad influences, or through errors in procedure, thus: "Gold and food destroy his longevity, land and a cow his body, a horse his eye, a garment his skin, clarified butter his energy, seasamum seed his offspring." IV, 189). The risk is so great that Yājñavalkya utters this warning (I, 213)[2]: "He who though fully competent to accept (*pratigraha-samarthopi*) does not accept a *dana* attains the several worlds which are attained by those who are charitable and attain by their gifts." Reluctance to accept (*pratigrahe samkucitahasta*) is one of the qualities of the person who is a fit donee, according to Vasiṣṭha (VI, 25, cited on p. 27, *infra*.) Sītā describes Rāma as a donor and as one who will not receive gifts.[3]

LAKṢMĪDHARA ON DĀNA PROCEDURE

The importance of the ritual in *dāna* is responsible for the careful description of *prayoga* in post-*Kalpataru* works on gifts. Lakṣmīdhara gives the special ritual for some of the greater gifts, along with the names of the mantras to be recited at the time, but the general rules are assumed as within the knowledge of his readers, or atleast the *purohits*, who will guide them, when they put the teachings of his work into effect. Some of the later works have chapters on *paribhāṣā* (definitions), corresponding to a general clauses section in relation to gifts (e.g. *Madanaratna*, p. 136 ff.) and (*Vīramitrodaya*, p. 130 ff.) in which such matters as the measurement of objects to be donated etc. are treated of. The general attitude of Lakṣmīdhara is that his work is addressed to kings and laymen, who will requisition the services of men learned in the details of ritual when necessary, and to *Vaidīkas* to whom detailed instruction will be unnecessary. In many cases, he merely mentions the short name of the *riks* to be used. (e.g. *Pāvamānam*, p. 283, *Rātrisūktam*, p. 283 etc.). In Appendix C, an attempt is made to identify the Vedic *mantras* to which Lakṣmīdhara has referred in this way. (pp. 354-358).

[1] हिरण्यमायुरन्नं च भूर्गौश्चाप्योषतस्तनुम् ।
अश्वश्चक्षुस्त्वचं वासो घृतं तेजस्तिला प्रजाः ॥

[2] प्रतिग्रहसमर्थोऽपि नाऽऽदत्ते यः प्रतिग्रहम् ।
ये लोका दानशीलानां स तानाप्नोति पुष्कलान् ॥

[3] दद्यान्नप्रतिगृह्णीयात् . . . . रामस्सत्यपराक्रमः (*Ramayaṇa*, V, 33, 25).

DAKṢIṆĀ

One of the conditions of a valid *dāna* is the presentation of a *dakṣiṇā* to the recipient, over and above the article given away. This is in accordance with the old Vedic ritual. Its omission will invalidate a *dāna* and make it productive of neither good nor evil. A *yajña* without *dakṣiṇā* and devotion (*s'raddhā*) is of the worst kind (*tāmasam*) according to the *Bhagavadgitā* (XVII, 11-13).[1] The *dakṣiṇā* is specified for various gifts. It must be in gold, except when gold itself is the gift, when the *dakṣiṇā* must be in silver. (*Dānakriyākaumudī*, p. 11 ; *Madnapradīpa*, p. 154). In many cases the exact *dakṣiṇā* is specified. Where such specific indication is wanting, the *dakṣiṇā* should bear a proportion to the value of the object given. According to the *Dāna-candrikā*, (p. 3) quoting Vyāsa, this should be one-tenth of the value of the object presented, where no proportion is specified for a *dāna*, but it is recommended that it should one-third of the value of the thing given away. In the gift of idols (*pratimā-dāna*) Divākara mentions a third or a fourth of the value of the thing presented as a suitable *dakṣiṇā* (*ib.* p. 68). Ten per cent of the value is the proportion indicated in *Madnapradīpa* (p. 156) on the authority of the *Skanda-purāṇa*, for gifts for which there is no fixed *dakṣiṇā*. To give a *dakṣiṇā* lower in value than that proper for the gift or sacrifice will be to run serious risks. According to Manu (XI, 40)[2] " the organs (of sense and action), honour, (bliss in) heaven, longevity, fame, offspring, and cattle are destroyed by a *yajña* at which too small *dakṣiṇas* are offered." Accordingly, Manu advises persons of small means to control their desire to perform meritorius acts, which entail the payment

अफलाकांक्षिभिर्यज्ञो विधिदृष्टो य इज्यते ।
यष्टव्यमेवेति पुनः समाधाय स सात्त्विकः ॥
अभिसंधाय तु फलं दम्भार्थमपि चैव यः ।
इज्यते भरतश्रेष्ठ तं यज्ञं विद्धि राक्षसम् ॥
विधिहीनमसृष्टान्नं मन्त्रहीनमदक्षिणम् ।
श्रद्धाविरहितं यज्ञं तामसं परिचक्षते ॥

इन्द्रियाणि यशः स्वर्गमायुः कीर्तिं प्रजाः पशून् ।
हन्त्यल्पदक्षिणो यज्ञः तस्मान्नाल्पधनो यजेत् ॥

of *dakṣiṇā*. (XI, 39)[1] Accordingly estimating the value of a gift, and in cases in which a gift is measurable by weight, cubic content or area to measure them properly, is a duty cast on the donor in order that there might be no error in dimension or valuation. Hence, later digests like *Madanaratna* (p. 154 ff) and *Vīramitrodaya* (p. 130 ff.) have sections called "*paribhāṣā*" (conventions) dealing with measurements of land (*bhūmānam*), of things (*dravyamānam*) etc. The *Kalpataru* omits such indications of the amount to be given and has no *paribhāṣā* section in its *Dānakāṇḍa*, consistently with its design of all such things to priests learned in *Prayoga*.

OTHER DETAILS OF DANA RITUAL

For each specific *dāna* there are certain specific *mantras* to be recited by the donor and the donee respectively, and certain formulæ to be uttered in making the gift and in accepting it. The later digests detail these. The *mantras* recited by the donor generally relate to the spiritual quality of the article given away, or are addressed to it as apostrophised. The *mantras* to be recited by the donee are usually the *Savitram* (beginning with the words "*Devasya tvā savituḥ prasave' śvinorbāhubhyām pūṣṇo hastābhyām, pratigṛhṇāmi*," (Taittirīya Samhita, II, 6, 8, 6, etc.) and the *Kāmastuti* (beginning with the words: "*Ka idam kasma adāt*," TB., 2, 2, 5, 5 etc., after which he should repeat the name of the object received and its tutelary deity. (*Dāna-kriyā-kaumudī*, p. 15).

The donor and the donee are to sit facing each other, the donor facing east, except in *kanyādāna* (gift of a virgin) when the donee sits facing east, and they are to sit on *kuśa* grass. They must both have bathed, performed *sandhyā*, and *ācamana* (sipping water thrice with *mantras*). Neither should wear wet clothes (*Vīramitrodaya*, p. 150, citing Āpastamba); and both should wear *pavitra* on their right ring fingers, and wear *uttarīya* (the second cloth). The hands should be held between the knees (*antarjānukaraḥ*), and the gift should be grasped by the

[1] पुण्यान्यानि कुर्वीत श्रद्धधानो जितेन्द्रियः ।
नत्वल्पदक्षिणैर्यज्ञैः यजेतेह कथंचन ॥

right hand. The *dakṣiṇā* must be placed in the centre of the right palm of the donee. Water should be poured through *kus'a* (*kus'odakam*) on the recipient's palm. The formula of giving should mention the name of the person to whom the gift is made, his father's name, his grandfather's name and *gotra*, the object given, and purpose of the gift, and the words of donation, *viz. tubhyam aham sampradate* must be followed (except, in the case of *kanyādana*) by the words *na mama*. A gift should not be made or received wearing yellow or coloured clothes, according to a verse of Bodhāyana quoted by Mitra Misra (*op. cit.* p. 150). Ordinarily a *dāna* must not be made at night, such gifts as *utkrānti-dāna* and gifts during eclipses being obvious exceptions. Other exceptions to the rule are marriages (in areas in which they are celebrated at night), the birth of a child, and the occurrence of *kaṭaka* and *makara-samkramaṇa*. During the *as'auca* (impurity) of either party a *dāna* is not permissible but in many cases a bath taken immediately before the ceremony purifies immediately (*sadyas'-s'aucam*). Those occupied in sacrifices, and *vratas* as well as kings are to be regarded as free of impurity, arising from birth or death. (*Dānakriyākaumudī*, p. 25).[1]

CLASSIFICATIONS OF GIFTS

There are many formal classifications of gifts according to form, purpose, parties, time, place, circumstance, object given away, ritual followed, and ethical nature. The divisions are useful in bringing out the elements of true and simulative or false gifts. Lakṣmīdhara gives some of the classifications for the purpose of bringing out the relevant features of a true *dāna* (pp. 5-11). The causative factors of gifts (*adhiṣṭhānāni*) of a *dāna* are six, according to Devala (p. 5), *viz., dharma, artha, kāma, vrīḍā* (shame), *harṣa* (joy) and *bhaya* (fear), and each may

[1] राज्ञां च सूतकं नास्ति व्रतिनां न च सत्रिणाम् ।
दीक्षितानाञ्च सर्वेषां यस्य चेच्छन्ति ब्राह्मणाः ॥
ऋत्विजां दीक्षितानां च यज्ञियं कर्मकुर्वताम् ।
सत्रि-व्रति-ब्रह्मचारि-दातृब्रह्मविदां तथा ॥
दाने विवाहे यज्ञे च सङ्ग्रामे देशविप्लवे ।
आपद्यपि हि कष्टायां सद्यः शौचं विधीयते ॥

inspire a gift. Of these the first alone is a true *dāna*. An old *Vaidīka* classification is fourfold: *dhruvam*, *ājasrikam*, *kāmyam* and *naimittikam* (p. 7). Manu (IV, 226) divides gifts into two classes, *viz.*, *aiṣṭika*, what is given in a *yajña*, and *pūrtika*, what is given outside the sacrificial enclosure (*vedī*), p. 10. The famous classification of *dānas* into *sāttvika* (morally good), *rājasa* (inspired by feeling) and *tāmasa* (black), which is made by the *Bhagavadgītā* (XVII, 20-22) is reproduced (p. 11) for the purpose of showing that the true gift should not be tainted by self-interest or association with wrong persons, places or moments. The essential features of a real *dāna*, its irrevocability (pp. 11-12) its reverential release, (pp. 12-13), its unsolicited fulfilment, its backing of intense devotion (*śraddhā*), which is even more important to its efficacy than *mantra* and *homa* (p. 14), its commencement and end in benedictory *mantras* (*svasttivācya*, p. 15) are all implicit in the classifications and are explained by Lakṣmīdhara by suitable citations.

Fit Objects of Dāna

Lakṣmīdhara's discussion of what is fit to be donated and what is not does not deal with particular things so much as classes of things. According to the old belief, which is reflected in the Vedas, many things which are included in major and minor gifts taint the recipient more or less seriously and are therefore either discouraged as gifts or condemned. There is apparent contradiction even in the most ancient literature on the suitability and the unsuitability of the same object for a gift or *dakṣiṇā*. Thus in the *Ṛgveda* (X, 107) the gift of horses is lauded; while in the *Taittirīya Saṃhita* (II, 2, 6, 3) it is included in the general condemnation of accepting animals with two rows of teeth.[1] On the other hand the *Gautama-Dharma-sūtra* (XIX, 16) says: "Gold, a cow, a dress, a horse, land, *tila*, clarified butter and cooked food are gifts which destroy sin.' The *Vīramitrodaya* cites an unidentified passage from the Veda (*śrutiḥ*) to the effect that an elephant should not be accepted as a gift. (*Na hastinam pratigṛhṇīyāt . . . iti śrutiḥ*, p. 99), though

[1] "A measure of himself he obtains who accepts an animal with teeth in both jaws, whether horse or man; he who has accepted an animal with teeth in both jaws should offer on twelve potsherds to Vaiśvānara" (Keith's trn. p. 151).

it devotes a great deal of space to the laudation of gifts of elephants, like other books on *Dāna*. In fact, there is hardly *any* object which is commended as bringing spiritual merit and advantage even in this life to the donor, which is not, at the same time, held out as sinful of acceptance. Divākara (*Danacandrikā*, p. 96) cities a s'loka [1] which condemns the acceptance of gifts of sesamum seed, cows, elephants, horses, buffaloes, skins, idols, a cow at the point of giving birth to a calf (*ubhayamukhī*), these are the seven gifts of terrible portent in acceptance. The last of these is praised as one of the most efficacious gifts in all works on *Dāna*, and yet, the *Dānaratnākara* (p. 45) cites a s'loka [2] from the *Ādityapurāṇa* which states that the fool (*mūḍho*) who accepts a *ubhaytomukhī* is bound by a thousand fetters of Varuṇa (*Varuṇa-pās'a*) each of which will take a century to loosen. Caṇḍes'vara himself devotes a section to the praise of this gift (pp. 303-308) which cites the *Matsyapurāṇa* to show that the donor of this cow will live in heaven as for as many *yugas* as there hairs on the body of the cow (p. 305). The whole of this section is 'borrowed' by Caṇḍes'vara from the *Dānakalpataru*, *infra*, pp. 165-176. On p. 45 of *Dānaratnākara*, Caṇḍes'vara quotes the Agni and Brahma purānas to show that grave post-mortuary calamities befall one who accepts the following as gifts: elephants, horses, chariots, the beds and seats of dead men, the skin of the black antelope (*kṛṣṇājina*), a cow at the point of delivery, etc. Such persons are asked to undergo the sacramental rites of birth, naming etc., anew.[3]

[1] तिलधेनुर्गजोवाजीमाहिषाजिनमूर्तयः ।
सुरभिस्सूयमाना च घोराः सप्तप्रतिग्रहाः ॥
इति निषेधात् ।

[2] किं करिष्यत्यसौ मूढो गृह्णन्नुभयतोमुखीम् ।
सहस्रं वारुणपाशात्क्षुरधारासिसम्मताः ॥
तस्य वर्षशतेपूर्णे पाशः एकः प्रमुच्यते ।
एतामवस्थामाप्नोति गृह्णन्नुभयतोमुखीम् ॥

[3] आग्नेयपुराणे—
हस्त्यश्वरथयानानि मृतशय्यासनानि च ।
कृष्णाजिनं च गृह्णाति अनापत्सु द्विजोत्तमाः ॥

Lakṣmīdhara omits both the mention and the explanation of such contradiction, though he must have been aware of them. The explanation is found in the sentence cited from the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara-purāṇa* in *Dānaratnapradīpa* (p. 99) that all acceptance of gifts destroys brāhmanic lustre[1]. A gift has to be looked at from two standpoints. From the point of view of the giver, the rarer or more valuable the gift, the greater the advantage to him, if the gift is accepted; while, from the standpoint of the donee, it carries a correspondingly heavy load of sin, that only his acquired *puṇya* (spiritual merit), *tapas* (pious austerity) and virtue springing from conduct and learning can overcome, with the aid of appropriate penances. In the theory of Dāna the monopoly of *pratigraha* conferred on the Brāhmaṇa was a source of danger rather than an enviable privilege.

The underlying principles of *Dāna* will explain the great importance attached in all discussions of Gifts to what may or may not be given away properly (*deyādeya*) and the qualities of the eligible donor and donee (*dātṛpratigṛhītṛ-lakṣaṇam*).

FIT CLASSES OF GIFTS

Lakṣmīdhara repeats the old teaching that one should not starve his family in a desire to be charitable. It is allowable to give away only what is left over after the needs of the donor and his family are provided for. He is a fool who starves his kith and kin and gives to strangers (p. 16). A man is not permitted to give away his all (*sarvasvam*), nor can he give away what is not his own. What is already promised away is not one's own, and so cannot form a new gift.

Can a wife or son be gifted away? Lakṣmīdhara cites Yājñavalkya (II, 175) who lays down that " without detriment

ततोऽभयमुखीं लोभात् सशैलां मेदिनीं द्विजः ।
गृह्णन् पापपरो नित्यं कूटसाक्षी च कापटी ॥
मद्यकृदधमो लोके स प्रेतो जायते नरः ।

[1] ब्रह्मपुराणे—
गृहीतानां तु तस्यां तु पुनस्संस्कारमर्हति ।
प्रतिग्रहेण विप्राणां ब्रह्मतेजो विनश्यति ॥

to one's property everything may be given away except wife and son." According to Dakṣa (p. 17) a wife and her separate property (*dārāśca taddhanam*) can not form gifts. He cites (p. 18) the verses of Kātyāyana (ed. Kane, vv. 638-639) which gives the right to sell or gift away wives and sons only in times of adversity, and which forbids the transactions when they are unwilling. The *Vyavahāramayūkha* denies ownership in wife and son, while the *Mitākṣarā* (II, 174) asserts it but rejects the right to give them away.[1] Lakṣmīdhara's position seems to underline their unwillingness as a cause of the ineligibility of wives and sons for gifts (p. 18).

The question of giving away a son arises in Adoption. Lakṣmīdhara relies on Vasiṣṭha (XV, 1-5), who holds that the parents have the right to give away, sell or abandon their sons, but forbids the adoption (giving and receiving) of an only son, and the gift of a son (in adoption) except with the husband's permission.

Among things which can not be gifts are used articles (p. 18), the proceeds of the sale of the Veda (p. 19) and the wages of prostitution (p. 19). The gift of gold, silver and copper to ascetics, cooked food to householders, curds to *vānaprasthas* (anchorites) and work to beggars is forbidden (p. 20). Certain things should not be given for common use by several donees, *e.g.* cows, a house, a woman, and a bed (p. 21). A gift which results from a contract (*praśna-pūrvam*) is condemned (p. 23). Advertisement destroys the merit of a gift (p. 24). Wealth from a vicious person is unfit for a gift (*asad-dravya-dānam asvargyam*, p. 22).

WHO CAN BE GIVEN A DĀNA

The determination of suitable receptacle (*pātra*) for a *dāna* is the heaviest responsibility laid on a donor, as a gift to an unsuitable person will not merely cancel the value of the gift but recoil on both giver and donee. The capacity of a gift to pull down a recipient makes the possession of adequate merit by a donee all the more important. The learned and virtuous Brāhmaṇa will have the capacity. The primacy (*sarvasya*

[1] Kane's ed. of *Vyavahāramayūkha*, 1926, p. 370.

prabhavaḥ, in the words of Yājñavalkya, I, 198-200) [1] of the Brāhmaṇa is due to his creation by the Creator for the protection of the Veda, the satisfaction of gods and ancestors, and the conservation and protection of Dharma. By mere erudition, or austere life fitness to receive a gift can not arise in a Brāhmaṇa unless these are combined with purity of life (p. 30). Devotion to Vedic study, pure birth, chastity, serenity, fear of sin, devotion to the Fire, addiction to religious vows, love of cows, repulsion to killing animals and *unwillingness to accept gifts*,—these are the qualities which make the ideal Brāhmaṇa recipient (p. 27). He will be one who does not eat the food of the S'ūdra (*S'ūdrānnam yasya na udare*, p. 28). Poverty and hunger are additional attributes of the ideal donee (p. 29). The genuine Brāhmaṇa is an embodiment of all virtues and sacred learning (p. 30). Even among Brāhmaṇas, who are eligible for gifts, there are degrees of merit and grades. A famous description of eight grades of Brāhmaṇas, arranged in the ascending order of merit (pp. 30-31) is given by Lakṣmīdhara, and is copied in later digests (*e.g.* *Dānaratnākara*, p. 51). The eight grades are *mātra* (the Brāhmaṇa whose only qualification is his caste), *Brāhmaṇa* (who, to merit the name, must have learning and character) *s'rotriya* (who has studied atleast one Veda with its adjuncts and is devoted to the six *karmas* and *yogas*), *anūcāna* (who besides being pure of heart and maintaining the six fires, has mastered the meaning of the Vedas), *bhrūṇa* (who has the additional merit of performing *yajñas* daily and subsisting by eating what remains of the offerings), *ṛṣikalpa* (who is master of himself as well as worldly and Vedic wisdom besides) *ṛṣi* (who, besides, lives a celibate and has acquired the power to bless or curse with effect), and *muni* (who has, in addition, gained control over his emotions and activities, and has become indifferent equally to gold and dross). Similarly, the digests beginning with the *Kalpataru* (p. 38) cite as authority

[1] तपस्तप्त्वासृजद्ब्रह्मा ब्राह्मणान्वेदगुप्तये ।
तृप्त्यर्थं पितृदेवानां धर्मसंरक्षणाय च ॥
सर्वस्य प्रभवो विप्राः श्रुताध्ययनशालिनः ।
तेभ्यः क्रियापराः श्रेष्ठास्तेभ्योऽप्यध्यात्मवित्तमाः ॥
न विद्यया केवलया तपसा वापि पात्रता ।
यत्र वृत्तमिमे चोभे तद्धि पात्रं प्रकीर्तितम ॥

Manu's enumeration of the nine kinds of *snātakas*, to whom both food and *dakṣiṇā* should be given everywhere, while for those who are not of the nine classes, though Brāhmaṇas, the gift of cooked food outside the sacrificial enclosure (*bahirvedi*) is alone permissible (XI, 1-3). The nine types thus commended are the Brāhmaṇa who desires help in order to make a sacramental marriage (*sāntanika*), he who needs support for performing a *yāga* (*yakṣyamāṇa*), he who is on his travels, (*adhvaga*), he who has given away his all (*sārva-vedasa*) as a gift in a *yāga*, he who solicits help on behalf of teacher, father or mother, and he who is afflicted with disease (*upatāpinā*ḥ). It will be noticed that Manu rests eligibility on the purpose or use to which a gift will be put, rather than on the personal attributes of the donee. It must be regarded as suggesting within the classes eligible, an order of preference based on the consideration of the past record in charity and future charitable purpose of the donee. The help to the diseased Brāhmaṇa is to be construed from the parallel passages of Gautama, Baudhāyaṇa and Āpastamba, which are cited, (pp. 38-39) as for the purchase of medicine (*auṣadhārtham*). To beg is permissible only on such accounts, for failure to help the teacher etc., might entail *their* transgression of the law (*niyamavilopaḥ*) according to Āpastamba (II, X, 1-3). To solicit a gift in the interests of a preceptor (*guru*) is extended in a famous legend of Kālidāsa (*Raghuvamśa*, V, 1-25) to solicitation of wealth to pay a *guru-dakṣiṇā* at the end of studentship. Āpastamba definitely prohibits begging for the sake of one's own sense-gratification. (*Indriya-prītyartham tu bhikṣaṇam animittam ; na tadādriyeta*).

WHO CAN NOT BE GIVEN A DĀNA

The sacramental nature of *Dāna* restricts its recipients to the first *varṇa*. Among the persons so eligible, the merit of a gift rises in magnitude from unit to a thousand as it is given to a Brāhmaṇa who is an *A-brāhmaṇa*, a *Brāhmaṇa-bruva*, a learned Brāhmaṇa and one who is master of the Vedas (p. 33). The six classes of Brāhmaṇas, who are *A-brāhmaṇas* are (p. 34), those who are respectively in the King's service, in trade, engaged in helping many persons to sacrifice (*bahu-yājaka*), village mendicancy,

and village and town service, as well as Brāhmaṇas who do not perform their daily rites. The *Brāhmaṇa-bruva* is defined, (p. 47) as one who having undergone the sacramental rites yet is devoid of Vedic knowledge and attachment to religious vows (*vrata-vihīna*). Brāhmaṇas who follow tainting occupations, such as cow-keeping, trading, artisanship, domestic service and lending money for interest, are to be excluded from gifts (Manu, VIII, 102 ff., cited on, p. 35). Dancers and singers (though Brāhmaṇas) are excluded by *Viṣṇu-smṛti*, XCIII, 14, (p. 40). To make gifts to Brāhmaṇas devoid of Vedic learning is described by Vasiṣṭha as pouring an offering on ashes (p. 42). The eligible Brāhmaṇa, who gives away the gift he has received to persons of ill-fame or misuses the gift should not (again) be given a *dāna* (p. 43). Those who teach (the Vedas) to S'ūdras (*vṛṣalādhyapakāḥ*, p. 44) the sinful Brāhmaṇa, who delights to injure living beings but conceals his wickedness like a cat (*baiḍālakavratī*) or the shortsighted one who is vicious and selfish like a crane (*baka-vṛttaḥ*) are also unfit to be donees, (p. 46) along with him who marries a *vṛiṣalī*, p. 48, (*vṛṣalīpatiḥ*). The last interdiction is not aimed at one who has married a S'ūdra wife (as such marriages are forbidden in Kaliyuga) but against the five kinds of *vṛṣalīs* described in the anonymous quotation in *Mitākṣarā* and the *Vīramitrodaya-vyavahāraprakās'a* (ed. Jīvānandanda, p. 73.)[1]

DONEES ELIGIBLE WITHOUT QUESTION

There are certain classes of persons to whom preference is recommended on the principle of charity beginning at home, provided they are otherwise eligible: a neighbour (*sannikṛṣṭa* or *āsannaḥ*), relatives, and descendants (p. 42). To overlook them in favour of distant eligibles is sinful. The performance of *saṃskāras* to orphan boys of Brāhmaṇa *varṇa* is lauded as excelling all gifts (p. 37). To give to father, mother, brothers, sons, one's wife and daughters is meritorious. Lakṣmīdhara adds the explanation that what is commended is a gift peculiarly the

[1] मिताक्षरायां स्मृतिः—
चण्डाली बन्धकी वेश्या रजस्था या च कन्यका ।
ऊढा या च सगोत्रेण वृषल्यः पञ्चकीर्तिताः ॥

own of the persons who are donees (*prātisvikam*) like the gift of learning to sons or *strīdhana* to daughters (p. 40).

The *purohita* is commended as a fit recipient by *Viṣṇu-smṛti* (XCIII, 5). Lakṣmīdhara adds the comment that *purohitas* and others (*ādayaḥ*) become fit (*pātrāṇi*) even if they have no other qualfications (*anyaguṇarahito api*) by the mere fact of their being *purohitas* etc., (p. 39). How this rule was acted upon in a liberal way is evidenced by the inscriptions of the Gāhadvāla dynasty, most of which are concerned with grants recording gifts made to the royal *purohita Jāgus'arman* and his son Paharājas'arman.[1]

The feeble (*dīna*), the blind (*andha*) and the miserable (*kṛpaṇa*) are recommended for gifts by preference by Samvarta (p. 40). That the rule is restricted, as regards *vaidha-dāna, i.e.* gifts in accordance with rules, only to Brāhmaṇas having these qualities, may be inferred by the citation of the *Mahābhārata* (p. 48) rule that the blind, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, and those afflicted by disease are to be maintained by the king, but they are not to be given gifts involving *pratigraha* (formal acceptance).

Gifts to Women

The prohibition of sacrifices by a woman, in her own right, (*Manusmṛti*, V, 155) involves, apart from her subordination or "perpetual tutelage," the disability to make *dānas*, which involve the recitation of *mantras*. *Nāradasmṛti*,[2] (p. 56 f.n.) definitely denies to women the right to make a gift. The presents made to a wife by father, mother, brethren at any time, and out of affection by the husband after marriage, and presents made by others at the wedding or *gṛhapravesa*, which are the six sources of *strīdhana* according to *Manusmṛti* (IX, 194)[3] do not come

[1] *See* the summary of the Kamauli plates etc., in the *Catalogue of Archaeological exhibits in the Lucknow Museum*, 1915, *passim* and *Epigraphia Indica*, XXVI, (1941), p. 69.

[2] नाधिकारो भवेत् स्त्रीणां दानविक्रयकर्मसु ।
यावत्सजीवमाना स्यात्तावद्भोगस्य सा प्रभुः ॥

[3] अध्यग्न्यध्यावाहनिकं दत्तं च प्रीतिकर्मणि ।
भ्रातृमातृपितृप्राप्तं षड्विधं स्त्रीधनं स्मृतम् ॥

within the strict meaning of *dāna*, and can not be held to establish a woman's right to *pratigraha*. The only authority, in works on *Dāna*, conceding the right to women (married) to receive a *dāna* is found in a verse of *Viṣṇudharmottara* [1] laying down that "a *dāna* to a woman should be given into the husband's palm, and in no other way." But as the procedure will not conform to s'āstra, the *dāna* should be regarded as *gauṇa*.

ELIGIBILITY OF A NON-BRĀHMAṆA TO RECEIVE A DĀNA

The question is raised in verses attributed to Bṛhaspati and Yama, cited in the *Kalpataru*, and in all subsequent digests. The verse of Yama says: "If the merit of a gift to a S'ūdra is equal to a unit (*samaguṇam*), then the merit of a *dāna* to a Vais'ya is threefold (that to the S'ūdra), of that to a Kṣatriya six-fold and to a Brāhmaṇa ten-fold." The estimate of Bṛhaspati [2] is slightly different: "If the merit of a *dāna* to a S'ūdra is one, it is twice that in a gift to a Vais'ya, thrice in a gift to a Kṣatriya, and six-fold in one to a Brāhmaṇa; while in a gift to a S'rotriya it is a thousand-fold, twice that in a gift to a preceptor (*ācārya*), a hundred-thousand-fold in a gift to one who knows his soul, (*ātmajñe*) and infinite in the case of a *dāna* to one who tends the sacred fire (*agnihotrin*)." The implication of these verses is that a *dāna* to a S'ūdra is of very low merit relatively to that to other castes, and that men of every caste may receive a *dāna*. But, the test of a proper *dāna* is its being made with proper religious rites, such as the recital by the recipient of the *sāvitra* and *kāmastuti*. This the S'ūdra atleast cannot do. Further, in the definition of the duties of the four *varṇas*, while *dāna* is common to all, *pratigraha* is only for the Brāhmaṇa. Lakṣmīdhara adds no comment, as perhaps he deemed it unnecessary in regard to a position ;well-known to all *s'iṣṭhas*. It has made later writers,

[1] Cited in *Madanaratna, Dānapradīpa*, p. 80:
स्त्रीणां दानं प्रदातव्यं भर्तृहस्तेषु नान्यथा ।
प्रोक्तं सङ्ग्रहणं ह्येतत् गुप्तं भर्तुः प्रयच्छतः ॥

[2] प्रथमबृहस्पति वाक्ये वर्णापेक्षया उत्कर्षः ।
द्वितीयवाक्ये ब्राह्मणापेक्षया ॥ .
एतच्च उत्कृष्टस्य ब्राह्मविषयम् ॥

made without *mantras*."[1] The comment of Mitra Mis'ra on the point in the manuscript is not clear (p. 58, *Dānaprakās'a*). *Abhayādāna* will apply to all classes of recipients. Govindānanda excludes it from *Dāna* proper on the ground that it involves only the removal of fear and no handing over. (*Dānakriyākaumudi*, p. 3).[2]

ANNADĀNA

Both the gift of food and the grant of asylum (*abhaya*, lit. freedom from fear) are treated by Lakṣmīdhara as within the scope of *Dāna*. He devotes separate sections to them. (*inf.* pp. 246-249 and pp. 252-254). While, following ancient authorities and the *Dāna* principle of proper *pratigraha*, the gift of food to Brāhmaṇas is praised, (p. 247) *annadāna* is justified on the more general ground of its being a source of life, (*annāttu prajananam nṛṇām*). Even the gods desire food, says the *Nandipurāṇa* (*devā hi annakāṁkṣiṇaḥ*, p. 248). Accordingly, it is wise to offer food to gods generally and particularly to one's favourite deity (*iṣṭadevatā*). The heaven of Prajāpati is attained by one who gives food even to insects, birds, dogs and outcastes (*caṇḍāla*). Caṇḍes'vara developes the merit of *annadāna* further (pp. 404-416) and points out the *puṇya* following the gift of provisions like *ghee*, oil, honey, salt, cookin g vessels and firewood for cooking, as corollaries (p. 416). Hemadri (p. 900) stresses the competence of all persons to get gifts of food (*na tasya pātravidhiḥ*). He cites the *Mahābhārata* (p. 893) to show that the gift of food to the S'ūdra is even more meritorious than to the Brāhmaṇa (which is an exaggerated way of declaring that the S'ūdra is equally entitled to food)—*annadānam hi ṣūdre ca brāhmaṇebhyo vis'iṣyate*—and to interdict any questioning of the hungry person as to his *gotra*, *caraṇa*, learning, native region etc. He developes the merit of the gift of provisions etc., from that of *annadāna* and of *āma* (uncooked or raw) *anna* (food) (p. 902).

[1] यत्तु बृहस्पतिना शूद्रादीनामपि पात्रोक्तता सा अन्नाच्छादनपरा। अन्नाच्छादनेषु पात्रं नैव विचारयेत्। "अन्नस्य क्षुधितं पात्रं विवस्त्रो वसनस्य च" इति विष्णुधर्मोक्तेः। अपात्रायाऽमन्त्रकम् देनम् ॥

[2] अभयदानस्य तु भयनिवारणरूपत्वात् सुतरामेव तत्र दानशब्दो गौणमेव ॥

The gift of drink to the thirsty is naturally associated with the gift of food. Hemādri, like later writers, gives a section to the provision of wells, and watersheds in desert places and roads (pp. ›95-906) and the gift of the pot filled with cool water (*dharma-ghaṭa*), while Lakṣmīdhara is content to refer to them in miscellaneous gifts (*prakīrṇa-dānāni*) *e.g.*, water-giving, p. 257*a* and 261, and water-sheds (*prapā*), p. 263. The *raison d'etre* of the *jala-dhenu-dāna* among the ten *dhenu-dānas* must have been the gift of water to the thirsty, but it was smothered by the ceremonies which made the gift of the containing vessel more important than that of the life-giving fluid it conveyed, (see *inf.* pp. 156-157). While in its transformed condition *jaladhenu* could only be given to a Brāhmaṇa, the gift of water and the provision of sources of water were open to every one, irrespective of *pratigraha* qualification.

ABHAYA-DĀNA

To the same class of gifts which are unrestricted as regard recipients belongs *Abhaya-dāna*, the gift of security, to which Lakṣmīdhara devotes a special section. One must live free from fear, if one is to live at all. *Abhaya-dāna* is open not only to all men, but to all living beings, and in its extended scope merges into *a-prāṇivadha* and *a-hiṃsā*. "The gift of *abhaya* to even a single living creature is better than the gift of a thousand cows to each of a thousand Brāhmaṇas," (p. 252). It should be made to animals, great and small, healthy and diseased, cruel or gentle. (*Nāndipurāṇa*, cited on p. 252). To refuse *abhaya* to a suppliant through fear, hatred or greed is as heinous as slaying a Brāhmaṇa, (p. 253). When an animal is being tortured or killed, to look on passively, when able to save it, is an inexpiable sin. Rāma's famous declaration that protection was due even to an enemy, who called for it, if one was not to incur the eternal censure of the world, is cited, (p. 253). It is greater than the formal gifts attended with ceremony and ritual, and is rightly included among major gifts by Lakṣmīdhara, undeterred by pedantic considerations.[1]

[1] It became a fruitful cause of war in Rājputana.

ĀROGYA-DĀNA

The gift of health goes with that of food and drink. On this ground the provision of hospitals and the work of the physician are lauded, as within an *Ārogya-dāna*. The practice of medicine is held to carry a taint, possibly through association with dissection of corpses in the period of training. Manu excludes the physician from s'rāddhas (III, 154 and 180) and his food is not fit to be eaten by a Brāhmaṇa (IV, 212). Notwithstanding so authoritative a pronouncement, Lakṣmīdhara gives special praise to the foundation of hospitals (*ārogyas'ālā*), declares the physician a *kṛtārtha* (one who has fulfilled his mission in life), if he succeeds in saving, by his skill and medicines, even one sufferer from pain and death, and confidently predicts for him, his ancestors and descendants upto seven generations, a place in the heaven of Brahma. The assurance is repeated : " he who relieves even to a small extent the pain of one afflicted with disease, obtains the same heavenly bliss as those who perform *yajñas* and sacrifices " (p. 251). In thus ennobling service to humanity by including it among the sacred gifts, Lakṣmīdhara, as a pioneer, shows his practical statesmanship. His omission to strain the meaning of the term *dāna*, following the *Mīmāmsa* in which he was proficient, and his refraining from explaining away the verses of Bṛhaspati which allow of *a-s'rotriya-pratigraha* have to be regarded as deliberate, in view of his humane conception of charity.

GIFTS TREATED OF BY LAKṢMĪDHARA

The bulk of the *Dāna-Kalpataru* is devoted to a detailed description of a number of gifts, mainly on purāṇic authority though occasionally smṛtis are cited in support of the commendation of the merit of particular *dānas*. A feature of the praises of *dānas* which has to be correctly appreciated is this. When it is necessary to commend one *dāna*, it is done with rhetorical exaggeration by declaring it to be higher than all or the best reputed *dānas*. A comparison of such superlatives will leave the impression that all gifts are equally of superlative eminence. Their relative value in the eyes of the *nibandhakāra* and his

contemporaries has to be gathered from precedence in treatment and, to some extent, from the care bestowed in elaborating details of ritual. Judged in this way it will be found that to Lakṣmīdhara (and, following him to other digest writers) the so-called *Mahādānas* are pre-eminent among gifts. They take up 71 pages (pp. 49-119). Next in importance will seem the ten *Meru* or *Parvata* or *Acala dānas*, and the ten *Dhenu dānas*, which take up the next two chapters (pp. 120-176). Five chapters which follow treat of the basic elements of the big gifts, *viz.*, the gifts of cows, bulls, skin of the black antelope (*kṛṣṇājina*), land (*bhūmi*) and gold (*suvarṇā*). The *parvata* gifts are spread over a *kṛṣṇājina*, and the *dhenu* gifts are similarly made on the spread out *kṛṣṇājina*, decorated so as to simulate a cow and its calf. In all the three major classes of *dānas*, gold plays the most important part, and after it silver, in decoration, in *dakṣiṇā* and in the gift proper itself. The black antelope was the holiest of animals, and the Aryan country was defined as that over which the antelope roams.[1] The *S'atapatha-Brāhmaṇa* repeatedly mentions the use of its skin in sacrifices.[2] Two black antelope skins represent heaven and the earth.[3] The black antelope skin represents the sacrifice.[4] It is the earth.[5] Its hairs represent the metres.[6] The body of a dead person was laid upon it as a sign of purity.[7] *Vasiṣṭha-smṛti* (XXVII, 20-22) declared that he who gives as a gift the skin of the black antelope, the hoofs of which are still attached to the skin, and the navel of which is adorned with gold, after covering the skin with *tila*, has given away the equivalent of the earth with its mountains and forests. The merit of a gift of gold, sesamum, honey or butter is multiplied when the article is placed on an antelopes skin and given away. The sanctity of the cow is ancient, and its gift is of supreme merit from the Vedic times. So of gold. Thus, in view of the ritual bringing all these into the *Mahādānas* and their corollaries the *dhenu* and *acala* gifts, it would be more logical to treat of these basic gifts before dealing with the better advertised *Mahādānas* etc. The precedence given to the latter must be explained on the ground of its lure to kings and princes to whom the great digests owed their existence, directly as inspirers or indirectly as the parties addressed.

[1] Manu, II, 23. [2] Eggeling's trn. *S. B. E.*, XII, 23, 25. etc.
[3] *Ibid.*, XXVI, 25. [4] XLI, 215-217.
[5] *Ibid.*, XLIV, 216. [6] *Ibid.*, XLI, 266. [7] *Ibid.*, XLIV, 200, 203.

The scope for infinite number and variety in gifts is disclosed by the permutations and combinations possible with basic elements and the construction of gifts by mimetic magic, as well as the utilisation of the principle that whatever is needed professionally by a person is the best of all gifts to him. It is to Lakṣmīdhara's credit that the number he had in view is comparatively small. It could not have been due to a larger number not having been evolved in his time, as the Purāṇas, which are his sources, deal with many more than he has described. It is noteworthy that Ballāla Sena, who is removed by only a generation from Lakṣmīdhara, takes credit for describing as many as 1374 gifts,[1] in his *Dānasāgara*, and he modestly adds that there were very many more which he could have described but did not through fear of taking up too much space.[2] Even small books like *Dānamayūkha* and *Dānacandrikā* deal with many more *dānas* than Lakṣmīdhara does. The way in which *dānas* are multiplied may be illustrated by instances. There are *acala-dānas*, perhaps so called because the things to be given away were, when solid, heaped on the antelope skin in a pyramidal form, or perhaps because each of them was believed to be like giving the mountain Meru itself. After the ten *acaladanas*, ten *s'ikhara*, or "peak" *dānas* come into existence (vide the enumeration from *Viṣṇu-dharma* cited in *Dāna-candrikā*, p. 66). The gift of cows is subdivided into (1) the gift of a thousand cows at a time, (2) the gift of the golden cow (*hemagavī-dāna*, *inf.* p. 177), (3) *Kāmadhenu*, (4) *Ratna-dhenu*, (5) *Rūpato-godāna*, (6) *Kapilā-dāna*, (7) *Ubhayatomukhī-dāna*, according to the form; and according to occasion of gift or specific purpose into six classes (*Dānacandrikā*, p. 52) *viz.*, *pāpa-apanoda*, sin-destroying cow-gift, debt-destroying *go-dāna*, *prāyasccitta-go-dāna*, *vaitariṇī-go-dāna* (the gift of a cow to enable the soul to cross the *Vaitaraṇi* river in the spirit world), the gift of a cow at the moment of death (*utkrānti-go-dāna*) and the gift of a cow to attain release (*mokṣa-dhenu-dāna*).

ANTIQUITY OF THE GREAT GIFTS

It should not be inferred from what has been said of the multiplication of *dānas* by imitation or division that the traditional

[1] *infra*. p. 341, sl. 53. [2] p. 342, sl. 68.

great gifts are of late evolution. The *Tulā-dāna* has an ancient history, and its presence in trans-Indian regions from which it was reimported into Mughal India in Jahāngīr's reign, will show that it might be a common inheritance of Aryan peoples. In the measurement of special buildings and even in house-construction, it is an ancient custom to take the unit of measurement as the finger, the span of the hand or the length of the foot of the owner. Similarly to measure a gift by the weight of a person seems natural. Its original purpose might have been what is now a subordinate feature of *Tulā·dāna*, *viz.* giving away a person's weight to get rid of disease or evil influence. The trans-Indian custom of weighing a person with edible articles, wearing apparel etc. seems also old. For one of the *mahā-dānas*, *viz. Kalpa-pādapa-dāna*, we have early epigraphic testimony. The famous inscription of King Kharavela of Kalinga at Hathigumpha states: "In the ninth year, he (Kharavela) gives away a Kalpa-tree with leaves on, and horses, elephants, and chariots with their drivers; he gives houses and asylums for all . . . to make all those gifts accepted, he also feeds Brāhmaṇas lavishly."[1] The passage in the inscription appears to refer not only to the *Kalpavṛkṣa-dāna*, but to three other *Mahādānas*, *viz.* the *Hemahasti*, *Hemahasthiratha*, and *Hiraṇyās'va*, and two *dānas* besides, *viz. gṛhadana* and *ās'raya dāna*, not to mention *annadāna*. The king who made the gifts was a Jaina, and the force of custom compelling kings to make such great gifts at coronation must have been great to make a non-Brāhmanical ruler perform them. That the habit had been deeply rooted in the land, so much so that persons of foreign birth, professing the Brāhamanical faith, were obliged to conform to it, is witnessed by the Nasik inscriptions, (X, XI and XIV) of Uṣavadāta (c. 120 A. D.) (Ṛṣabhadatta), son-in-law of the satrap Nāhapāṇa, which describe the many magnificent charities of this prince. They are summarised in Pandit Bhagavanlāl Indrāji's *History of Gujarat*, 1896, pp. 25-26, and in the editions of the inscriptions in *Epigraphia Indica* (VIII, p. 78 ff.) Summed up, his benefactions come under the following heads of *dāna*: many *gosahasra-dānas*; *suvarnadāna*; *agrahāra-pratiṣṭhā*; *bhūmidāna*; cost of many *kānyadānas*; *vṛkṣa-pratiṣṭhā*; *ās'raya*, *pratis'raya*,

[1] Dr. K. P. Jayaswal's trn., *J. B. O. R. S.*, III, 1917, p. 463.

gṛhadānas, *maṭhadāna*, *vāpi-kūpa-taḍagadi-dāna* and *setubandha-dānam.* Instances in later history are innumerable. The inscriptions of As'oka show that *ārogya*, *ās'raya*, *pratis'raya* and *abhaya dānas* were among the emperor's benefactions.

THE MAHĀDĀNAS

The classical enumeration gives these as sixteen. They are: (following the enumeration of Lakṣmīdhara): (1) *Tulā-puruṣa*; (2) *Hiraṇyagarbha*; (3) *Brahmāṇḍa*; (4) *Kalpapādapa*; (5) *Gosahasra*; (6) *Kāmadhenu*; (7) *Hiraṇyās'va*; (8) *As'varatha*; (9) *Hemahastiratha*; (10) *Pañcalāngala*; (11) *Pṛthivi*; (12) *Vis'vacakra*; (13) *Kalpalatā*; (14) *Saptasāgara*; (15) *Ratna-dhenu*; and (16) *Mahābhūta-ghaṭa dānas.* Alternative names are *Dharā-dāna or Hemadharā-dāna for Pṛthivīdāna*, and *Mahā-kalpalatā* for *Kalpalatā.* Of these the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, in which the donor enters a golden vessel, and simulates a rebirth, has been used for the purpose of elevating the social status of kings, and make them claim equality in interdining with Brāhmaṇas. In Travancore it was in use in every new reign, along with *Tulāpuruṣadāna*, the first signifying acquisition of divinity as well as royalty, and the second royalty. The first ends with the *mantra*: "Formerly I was born a man of my mother; now born of you I assume a divine form" (p. 66, ll. 5-6). The *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Vis'va-cakra*, *Pṛthivi*, *Saptasāgara*, and *Mahābhūtaghaṭa* symbolise the gift of the entire universe and its contents, by the reincarnated donor. The two *Kalpalatā* gifts symbolise the donor's capacity to grant all wishes; when they are symbolically given, every wish has been fulfilled in the donee. So with the *Kāmdhenu-dāna.* In every case no living animal or plant is used, but figures in gold, sometimes jewelled, are used. The objects are made ornate to complete the symbolism, and they are given away to the priests, the chief priest getting a much bigger share than the others, who range in number from four to eight. The feeding of Brāhmaṇas and making presents of gold etc., to them are incidental to all the gifts. The solemnity of the gifts is enhanced by the preparation which the donor has to undergo, the collection of the materials for the ceremony, the preparation of the chief object, the invocations of deities, the addresses to the objects to

be given away or, as in *Tulādāna* to the balance itself, and the general resemblance throughout of each *dāna* to the great sacrifices (*sattra*) of Vedic times. The spiritual advantages held are relatively small, as compared with those promised for many smaller *dānas*, but none of them will have the spectacular, publicity and emotional aspects of the *Mahādānas*, which therefore naturally appealed to kings, especially of newly founded kingdoms. To perform these sixteen great gifts lifted a new ruler to a position of social eminence among princes and in the princely order. The placing of *Tulādāna* first in his enumeration by Lakṣmīdhara, while in other lists it comes third, was perhaps deliberate. To the Gāhaḍvālas the first had more significance than the second and third which meant only a rise in *varṇa*, which might not be recognised easily even after *Hiraṇyagarbha* by rival kings or the sacerdotal order. Aparārka (p. 326) cites a purāṇa (omitted by Lakṣmīdhara) to the effect that the gift of *Kalpavṛksa* might cure sonlessness in man or woman.[1]

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF THE PRACTICE OF MAHĀDĀNAS

Indian history has benefited more from the practice of charitable donations than the history perhaps of any other country. Though ostentation is detrimental to the spiritual effect of a *dāna*, to say that a prince had performed the prescribed gifts was deemed only a declaration of his orthodoxy and goodness, and the claim in inscriptions was not barred, especially when made by successors in glorifying their ancestors, as in such cases it will not be self-advertisement. The prescription in *smṛtis* of a permanent record for gifts of land and the practice of making village bodies trustees in perpetuity for endowments of a religious character led to the wide-spread practice of recording all such gifts on copper-plates. The epigraphic material now available is very largely in the form of such grants or *dāna-patra.*

[1] अस्य भविष्योत्तरे विशेषः—श्रीभगवानुवाच—
अपुत्रः पुरुषो यश्च नारी वा पर्वतात्मजे ।
सौवर्णस्तेन दातव्यः कल्पवृक्षो गुणान्वितः ॥
तेन पुत्रवतां लोके गच्छेद्देवि न संशयः ।

Pilgrimage (*tīrtha-yātra*), vows (*vrata*) and gifts (*dāna*) replace the old *yāgas* in popularity with kings. It is possible that the substitution was encouraged by the tradition that *Kṣatriyas* had been uprooted by Paras'u Rāma, and that rulers of our age were not of the second caste, and therefore not possessed of *adhikāra* (spiritual right) to perform *yāgas*. The prescription of gifts as means of salvation in the Kaliyuga, as compared with *tapas*, *yajña*, and *satyam* in older ages, must be read with the Purāṇic statement that in the Kali age kings will not be *Kṣatriyas*.

Some instances may be cited. Dantidurga (c. 754 A.D.) repaired to Ujjain, where he performed the *hiraṇya-garbha-dana*.[1] A courtesan of Paṭṭādkal gave in c. 770 A.D.: an *ubhaya-mukhī-dāna*.[2] Three rulers of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa line are known from their inscriptions to have done the *Tulāpuruṣa-dāna viz.*, Dantidurga, Indra III (c. 915 A.D.) and Govinda IV (c. 918 A.D.)[3] In South India, the Coḷa emperor Rājarāja performed the *Hiraṇya-garbha* and *Tulāpuruṣadāna*, with his queen Dantis'aktī in the 29th year of his reign (c. 1114 A.D.)[4] The gold used in this ceremony was utilised in a later donation by the queen next year.[5] Parāntaka I (907-953 A.D.) claims to have done many *hemagarbha* and *tulābhāra* dānas[6]. In North India, the Candravali plate of the Gāhaḍvāla Candradeva (1093 A.D.) as well as the Candravati plate of 1099 contain exhortations on the transitoriness of life, the eternal character of charitable donations, especially of land and the resolution of the king, to make a gift of land, after consulting those who were learned in the s'āstras, and in accord with *s'ruti* and *smṛti*.[7] The allocution is significant as coming from an ancestor of Lakṣmīdhara's patron Govinda-candra.[8] After the composition of Hemādri's *Dānakhaṇḍa*, which became better known in South India than his original, the

[1] *Epigraphia Indica*, XVIII, p. 248.

[2] *Indian Antiquary*, XI, p. 125.

[3] *Indian Antiquary*, XI, p. 111; *Epigraphia Indica*, IX, p. 24; *Epigraphia Indica* VII, p. 30.

[4] *Madras Epigraphist's Report*, 1907, No. 42. For *Hiraṇyagarbha* in modern times. See Galletti, *The Dutch in Malabar*, p. 110.

[5] *South Indian Inscriptions*, VIII, 237.

[6] *Ibid.*, II, p. 383, v. 7.

[7] *Epigraphia Indica*, XIV, pp. 193-209. Thirty-two villages were given as *dakṣiṇā* after the performance of *go-sahasradāna* and *tulāpuruṣa-dāna*.

[8] Saheṭ-Maheṭ inscription of Govindacandra (1125 A.D.) mentions a *hema-tulādāna* of Govindacandra. *Epig. Ind.*, XI, pp. 20ff.

Kalpataru, gifts are made, on the express authority of Hemādri. Thus in an inscription dated 1369 A.D., commemorating the construction of an irrigation reservoir, the following statement is made of the donor: "v. 22. Making charities in various ways in keeping with the treatise of Hemādri, he heard that the merit attaching to the gift of water was the greatest of all."[1] A similar allusion to Hemādri is found in a Mysore inscription dated 1405 A.D.[2] The feeding of a hundred-thousand Brāhmaṇas and the performance of the *pancalāngala* by Devaraya II of Vijayanagara (about 1428 A.D.) are commemorated in an inscription.[3] Kṛṣṇadevarāya[4, 5] and Acyutarāya performed *tulāpuruṣadānās*. In Orissa, Anaṅgabhīma III (d. 1238 A.D.) performed a *tulāpuruṣadāna* at Puri.[6] As late as 1568 A.D., Mukunda, the last of the Gajapati dynasty, claims to have done this *mahādāna*.[7] Its revival in Mughal times by Hindu princes was due to revivalist influences.

THE TEN GREAT GIFTS

The term *Mahādāna* is usually associated only with the above sixteen gifts. But the later digests quote a s'loka which is found both in *Kūrmapurāṇa* (from which it is cited by both *Dānamayūkha*, p. 151, and *Dānacandrikā*, p. 17) which mentions ten *mahādānas* (*das'a-mahā dānāni*). These are: gifts of gold, horses, sesame seed, elephants, slave girls, chariots, land, houses, a virgin for marrriage, and the *kapila* cow. The objects named show that the list is old, as it refers to things which have always been esteemed as gifts. Sesame is an essential additional ingredient of the donation in all gifts, including the sixteen great gifts etc. Some of these are dealt with by Lakṣmīdhara in separate sections (*e.g.*, *suvarṇadāna*, pp. 194-199; *bhūmidāna*,

[1] Porumamilla tank inscription, *Epig. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 97ff.

[2] *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Tirthahalli, 12, in Vol. VIII.

[3] *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, XIII, p. 3.

[4] *Epig. Ind.*, VII, p. 17.

[5] *Madras Epig. Rep.*, 1919, ins. 511, 543 and 546; 1920, para 47. The *tula-dana* of Acyutaraya was of pearls. He did the *hiraṇya-pṛthvī* (*suvarṇa-kṣma*) *mahadana* also, *Epig. Carn.*, Sh. 1, in Vol. VII, and Hn. 13, Vol. X.

[6] R. D. Banerji, *History of Orissa*, 1930, I, p. 262.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 347.

pp. 186-193; *kapilā-go-dāna*, pp. 161-166), or are very briefly referred to in the chapter on *prakīrṇadānāni* (pp. 266-275). In this section will be found approval of *tila-dāna* daily (*tilā nityam pradātavyā yathāśakti*), (p. 258), *gṛha-dāna*, (p. 257, 258, 260) gifts of chariots, (p. 267) and horses, (p. 257). It is noteworthy that no special mention is made of such gifts as *kanyādāna*, *gajadāna* and *dāsīdāna*. The first of these is pertinent in a general digest embracing the whole field of Dharma like the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* to its *Gṛhastha-kāṇḍa*, the second will be beyond the means of those who cannot make the 36 major gifts among which it will come incidentally, and the last (*dāsī-dāna*) would have become obsolete in its days. The provision of *naiveśika* (interpreted by the *Mitākṣarā* as the requisites of marriage, such as a virgin bride, ornaments and houses) to learned Brāhmaṇas is enjoined as a regal duty by Yājñavalkya (I, 333).[1] The section on *dvijasthāpanam* (pp. 254-256) deals with this provision, but as a moral duty of the affluent, rather than as a duty of the king, as laid down by Yājñavalkya. The *agrahārapatiṣṭhā*, which is alluded to in *Raghuvamsa* (I, 44), and which is a feature of regal gifts, as recorded in inscriptions, and as claimed by Lakṣmīdhara himself as one of his achievements, has to be associated with this section. It is curious that for so important a topic fuller treatment is not accorded.

OTHER TEN DĀNAS

The *Madanaratna* cites Jātūkarṇya for an enumeration of ten gifts, which are recommended to be made at the moment of death (*utkrāntya*). These are of cows, land, *tila*, gold, clarified butter, clothing, grains, molasses, silver and salt. These gifts are to be made when one is about to die or after he is dead, for his benefit. The sixteen great gifts are to be regarded, according to a verse of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, quoted by Hemādri (p. 20),

[1] उत्क्रान्त्यावीनि दानानि दशदद्यान्मृतस्य तु ।
गोभूतिलहिरण्याज्यवासोधान्यगुडानि च ॥
रौप्यं लवणमित्याहुर्दशदानान्यनुक्रमात् ।
एतानि दशदानानि नराणां मृत्युजन्मनोः ॥
कुर्यादभ्युदयार्थं च प्रेतेऽपि हि परत्र च ।

as gifts *par excellence* (*ati-dānāni*).[1] He also cites the *Sāmavedopaniṣad* for regarding the gift of cows, land and books Sarasvatī or learning as three *atidānas*.[2]

THE ACALA AND DHENU GIFTS

The Meru mountain is the centre of the Universe and is inhabited by the gods and demigods. The *acala-dānas* are to apostrophise this holy mountain (as described on p. 125), and the various objects are to be addressed as having taken the form of this mountain (*parvata-rūpeṇa pāhi ṣamasāra-sāgarāt*, p. 128). In short, the Meru gift is a kind of multiplier, combining the gift of all the contents of the mountain, emblematically represented by figures of gold, and the particular articles to which mystic virtues are attached : (*e.g.*, *Tila* is supposed to be sacred because born of the body of Viṣṇu, p. 132. The *Dhenu* is supposed to represent the *S'akti* of the *Trimūrti* and particularly of Lakṣmī, and to carry with it the sin-destroying efficacy of the *go-dāna* (*sarvāpāharā dhenuḥ*, p. 142). The cows are apostrophised in the *mantra* for the gifts under this head. (p. 144). The gifts of this class are not to be deemed as substitutes for *go-dāna* but to exceed it in virtue, probably because of the combined virtue of the component principles.

GO-DĀNA

The sanctity of the cow follows from the ancient pastoral life of Aryan peoples. In the *Ṛgveda* divine honours are paid to it. It is called a goddess)*R. V.* VIII, 101),[3] and is hymned as the mother of the Rudras, the daughter of the Vasus, the sister of the Ādityas and the source (*nābhi*) of nectar. Its sanctity

[1] महादानानि वै विद्यादतिदानानि सर्वदा ।
"महादानानि" वक्ष्यमाणानि षोडश तुलापुरुषादीनि, इति हेमाद्रिः ।

[2] श्रीण्याहुरतिदानानि गावः पृथ्वी सरस्वती ।
नरकादुद्धरन्त्येव जपवापनदोहनात् ॥

[3] माता रुद्राणां दुहिता वसूनां स्वसादित्यानाममृतस्य नाभिः । प्रनु वोचं चिकितुषे जनाय मा गामनागामदितिं वधिष्ट । वचोविदं वाचमुदीरयन्तीं विश्वाभिर्धीभिरुपतिष्ठमानाम् । देवीं देवेभ्यः पर्येयुषीं गामा मावृक्त मर्त्यो दभ्रचेताः ॥

was communicated to *pañcagavya*, which is administered as the sovereign purifier.[1] Its touch purified, and only its mouth was impure.[2] To defend the cow was a duty, like defending Brāhmaṇas, and one who lost his life in doing so was saved by the service from the most heinous sins.[3] The ordinary benediction is '*go-brāhmaṇebhyo śubham astu nityam*' ('may all be well with cows and Brāhmaṇas'). It took precedence in such phrases, which recur in inscriptions, of even the first *varṇa*. To have a cow was to have not only a useful animal, but to have Lakṣmī dwelling in the house. The dun cow (*kapilā*) was regarded, perhaps on account of her rarity, as even holier that the ordinary cow. We can therefore understand the attention given by Lakṣmīdhara to the gift of this divine animal in various forms and circumstances; as herself, (*pratyakṣata*), or (*rūpato*) as *kapilā*, and as *ubhayatomukhī* (pp. 158-160, 161-166, and 166-176). To give a golden image of the cow was even more sanctifying. It combined the virtues of gold and the cow in one gift. It may be noted that in all gifts of cows, the gilding of the horns with gold and of the hoofs with silver is prescribed (*hemaśringīm, rūpya-khurām*, p. 158). As the gift of cows alone without similar provision for stud-bulls, is incomplete economically, *vṛṣabha-dāna* is commended. The gift should be of a bull and it may be subsequently used for draught or pulling the plough (pp. 170-171).

GIFT OF ANTELOPE SKIN

The gift of *kṛṣṇājina* signifies not only its intrinsic holiness but is in accord with the precept that the best of all gifts is what is likely to be useful to the recipient.[4] The Brāhmaṇa in all *āśramas* needed it as a seat for himself, and it was required as a

[1] *Baudhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra*, II, 20 ; *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, III, 314.

[2] *Manusmṛti*, V, 125 : *gavāghrātam . . . mṛtprakṣepana śuddhyati*. The impurity of the cow's mouth, to which Medhātithi alludes (*gavo medhya mukha-dṛte*) is balanced by the purity of the hind quarters. (*Manusmṛti*, V, 130).

[3] *Manusmṛti*, XI, 79 ; *gavārthe sadyaḥ prāṇān parityajet, mucyate brahm-hatyā, goptā go-brāhamaṇasya ca*.

Madanapradīpa, p. 79.

येन येन च भाण्डेन यस्य वृत्तिरुदाहृता ।
तत्तस्यैव प्रदातव्यं पुण्यकामेन धीमता ॥

base for the *acala* gifts. Its donation is best for one who maintains the holy fire (*ahitagni*, p. 186).

The Gift of Land (Bhumidana)

In historical times the gift which was most valued was that of land. Its permanence and fruitfulness gave it precedence over other gifts. As the donee, being a Brahmana would enjoy, even without express grant, immunity from taxation for it, and it would be heritable, it was much esteemed. The reckless gift of land might embarrass kings who succeeded as descendants or conquerors those who lavishly gave away lands. The resumption of lands so given away would be a natural proceeding for one who sought to economise the resources of the state. Land which passed into Brāhmaṇa hands was like fiefs *in mortmain* in mediaeval England. But, the ordinary rule of irrevocability, applicable to all gifts[1] was applied with special stringency (and strengthened by imprecations of a terrifying kind) to guard against any attempts to resume lands which had been given as *dana*. Land (*bhu*) was sacred to Viṣṇu (*bhur-vaisnavi*, p. 190), and anscestors are said to shout with joy when a son is born in their line, according to Brhaspati, because they feel that there is a (potential) giver of land in charity (p. 190). For safety, the gift of land is asked to be engraved on copper plate grants,[2] of which records would be kept in the state archives. It was the duty of the *Mahasandhivigrahika* (the analogue of the *Nāna Fadnavis* of the later Maratha empire) to compose and supervise such grants.[3] Lakṣmidhara held this office. The section on *bhumidana* (pp. 186-193) omits these rules, in which he must have been expert. The reason is that the *Danakanda* was only a section of a digest, and the *Vyavaharakanda* is the proper section

[1] Yajñavalkya, II, 176.

प्रतिग्रहः प्रकाशस्स्यात् स्थावरस्य विशेषतः ।
देयं प्रतिश्रुतं चैव दत्वा नाऽपहरेत्पुनः ॥

[2] *Bṛhaspatismṛti* (ed. Rangaswami), pp. 61-62.

[3] Altekar, *Raṣtrakūṭas*, 1934, p. 166.
Mitākṣarā cites (I, 319-320) the following text :

सन्धिविग्रहकारी तु भवेद्यस्तस्य लेखकः ।
स्वयं राज्ञा समादिष्टः स लिखेद्राजशासनम् ॥

to deal with them. The Gāhaḍvālas, whom he served, delighted to give away lands, and the inscriptions of Govindacandra and his predecessors (*e.g.*, the Basāhi plate of 1104 A.D., *Ind. Antiq.* XIV, pp. 100 ff, and the Rāhan plate of 1109 A.D., *ib.* XVIII, pp. 14 ff,) contain eulogies of *bhūmidāna*. The grants are carefully drawn up in legal terms and all the regalia, *i.e.*, state's rights, which are given away with the lands are named in the grants.

VIDYĀDĀNA

From an epigraphist's point of view the chief pre-occupation of royal donors would appear to be the gift of lands, which is the ordinary subject of a copper-plate grant.[1] Curiously, Lakṣmīdhara devotes less space to it than he gives to another gift, which he deals with *con amore*, as a scholar as well as a statesman. (pp. 200-228). Later digests virtually reproduce Lakṣmīdhara's section on this subject. The gift of the Veda (*brahmadānam*), according to *Manusmṛti* (p. 200, IV, 223) excels all other gifts. The praise is endorsed by Yājñavalkya (I, 212). Yama widens the scope of the gift (p. 201) by making it the gift of the *s'āstras*. The citations are loosely strung by Lakṣmīdhara, and it may seem that the commendation of the present of transcripts of sāstraic, purāṇic and other works, which forms the bulk of the citation, was applicable also to the Veda. This is not the correct view. There was prejudice against the substitution of books for oral instruction in ancient India,[2] and the " seller of the Veda "

[1] About five-hundred copper plate grants are preserved in the office of the Government Epigraphist at Madras. Of these over 400 deal with land grants. See *List of Inscriptions in the Office of the Superintendent of Epigraphy*, 1941, pp. 118-136.

[2] Aparārka (p. 1114) cites the following s'loka, among others, from *Caturvims'atimata* prescribing penance for selling the Veda :

चान्द्रायणं प्रकुर्वीत एकाहाद्वेदविक्रये ।

Smṛticandrika (*ed. Mysore*) I, p. 51 states that he who has studied from books, relying thereon, and not learnt from his Guru, fails to shine in an assembly, even as women who have been impregnated by paramours ; and that reliance on books is of the same category as dicing, acting, women, idleness and sleep in being an obstruction to learning :

पुस्तकप्रत्ययाधीतं नाधीतं गुरुसन्निधौ ।
भ्राजते न सभामध्ये जारगर्भ इव स्त्रियाः ॥

(*Veda-vikrayī*), who is held up to reprobation, is not only the person who offends against the canon of free teaching, but against one who offends against the spirit of oral teaching by writing out the Veda and selling it. The way in which instruction is to be given is oral. This is shown by the citation from the *Mahābhārata* (p. 203) where the work of the teacher "who speaks (*brūyāt*) the holy Veda (*dharmyām brāhmīm sarasvatīm*) to the pupil is lauded. The literature to be reduced to writing, so as to be given as gifts, consists of the *Vidyās* and *Kalas* among which the *Nandipurāṇa*, which Lakṣmīdhara quotes extensively, includes the Vedas and their angas (p. 208) but it avoids suggesting that copies of the sacred canon should be made for sale of presentation. The implication of its description (p. 213, lines 1-2) is that what is commended is gift of such knowledge orally by teacher to pupil. The section is valuable for giving a conspectus of the knowledge available at the time, and of the contents of the Purāṇas, as well as the realistic description of the work of the copyist, and the glorification of his calling and of calligraphy.[1]

KALPADĀNA

The gift of *kalpas*, or months of Brahma (p. 230), which as enumerated number thirty in all, seems a mystic ceremony in which images of gold representing each of the *kalpas* were given away, after an unspecified ritual.

GIFTS ACCORDING TO AUSPICIOUS MOMENTS

The merit of a *dāna* is enhanced if it is made at a *tīrtha* or holy place like Prayāga or Kāsʼī, or on the banks of a sacred stream or at the confluence of rivers or on the banks of the

[1] For a fuller treatment see my article on *Vidyadāna* in *Aṇṇāmalai Commemoration Volume*, 1941, pp. 496-512.

द्यूतं पुस्तकशुश्रूषा नाटकासक्तिरेव च ।
स्त्रियस्तन्द्री च निद्रा च विद्याविघ्नकराणि च ॥

Commenting on Valmiki's injunction (I, 5, 4) on hearing the *Rāmāyaṇa* chanted :

धर्मकामार्थसहितं श्रोतव्यमनसूयया ।

Govindaraja explains :

'श्रोतव्यम्' न तु स्वयं लिखितपाठेन निरीक्षितव्यम् ।

ocean. The treatment of the merit of localities is omitted in this book by Lakṣmīdhara, as one of the sections of the digest is the *Tīrtha-kāṇḍa*. But the indication of proper times, by *tithi*, *nakṣatra*, or *māsa* is relevant to *dāna*, and is briefly touched upon (pp. 240-249).[1] As gifts, which should form part of special ceremonies or ordinary daily routine come up in the sections of the digest on *Kāla*, *S'rāddha*, and *Tīrtha* the perfunctory way in which the matter is dealt with here, as compared with later works on *Dāna*, will be intelligible.

MISCELLANEOUS GIFTS

A large number of minor gifts are lumped together in a chapter to which the title *prakīrṇa* (scattered) is given, following the usage of some of the later smṛtis like those of Bṛhaspati and Nārada. There is a certain amount of repetition in this chapter of what is stated in previous and succeeding chapters. The lists are illustrative and not exhaustive, as Ballāla Sena was able to name nearly 1400 *dānas* in his *Dānasāgara*. The *Dānaratnākara* and the *Madnaratna*, which closely follow the *Kalpataru*, have this section, but the former has condendsed and the latter has rearranged the matter of their original. The miscellaneous enumeration brings in about fifty more gifts. These include vital things like the gift of life, gifts to enable a person to get married (*naives'ika*), the sacred thread (*yajñopavīta*) and ingredients for the daily fire-rites like clarified butter, *sarpis* and seating planks (*āsana*), articles of apparel, turbans (*uṣṇīṣa*), fans, fly-whisks (*cāmara*), umbrellas (*chatra*), shoes, ornaments, unguents and scents (*candana, gandha*), flowers, incense, pearls, conches (*s'ankha*), *pān* (*tāmbūla*), oils for consumption and lighting, lamps, (*dīpa*), *āmalaka*; (the Indian gooseberry), medicines, fruit and edible and medicinal roots, beds and bedsteads (*s'ayyā* and *s'ayana*), cooking and other household vessels, fuel for cooking and for warmth in

[1] Hemādri and Madansimha expand the gifts according to appropriate moments so as to bring in gifts for all the five (*pancanga*) features of the day, and deal with gifts for each day of the week (*varadāna*), and each *yoga* and *karaṇa* (*Hemādri*, pp. 806-814). The six seasons (*ṣaḍṛtavaḥ*) and the two solstices (*ayana*) have their gifts in *Madnaratnapradīpa* (pp. 124-125), while the gifts at the intersection of the *ayanas* (*saṁkranti*) are always famous (Hemādri, p. 814 ff.) The inscriptions show that gifts were invariably made in connection with the moments declared as specially efficacious.

winter, grains of all kinds, condiments, cooked food (*anna*), milch-cows, salt, (*lavaṇa*) sugar, sugarcane-juice and honey, draught oxen, horses, elephants and carriages (*upānaha*), musical instruments and above all the gift of sacred knowledge (*brahma-dāna*). That the list is not meant by Lakṣmīdhara himself to be exhaustive is seen by the omission of an article so usually give as woollen blankets (*kambaḷa*), when such a thing as the domestic bucket for water (*ghaṭīpātra*) is not forgotten. *Viṣṇusmṛti* (XCII, 32) is cited (p. 268) for the comprehensive statement that whatever a man possesses which is dear to him or covetable by others (*iṣṭatamam loke*) is a (suitable object of *dāna*.

Definite Results of Gifts

In the ancient theory of *dakṣiṇā* and *dāna*, an invisible but all the same potent and indestructible influence follows from them, when properly given. This vague indication was perhaps insufficient to stimulate liberality. So, specific results of a postmortuary character are attached to each of the major, and to even each of the minor gifts. According to Hemādri, (p. 827) gifts which have an immediate effect in life are of two kinds : those which increase enjoyments (*bhogada*) and those which destroy illnesses (*roga-hara*). Man is surrounded by evil influences, which will prevail against him unless countered. They may spring from the conjunctions of moments, (hence *dānas* for each *tithi*, *vāra* and *nakṣatra*), or through the adverse influence of planets, which require to be counteracted by *grahas'ānti* (pacificatory) rites and gifts. The *Kalpataru* has a special section dealing with propitiatory rites (*s'ānti-karma*). It is the thirteenth part of the great Digest, and is the progenitor of works, which deal with apprehensions due to evil influences and ways of overcoming them by propitiation (*s'anti*) like *S'ānti-Kamalākara*. The omission of such topics as *grahas'ānti* by gifts in the section dealing with *Dāna* is obviously to prevent repetition. Hemadri and *Madanaratna* (pp. 1147 ff.) deal with *graha-s'ānti* under gifts as they apparently had no separate work dealing with propitiations of all kinds, of which gifts will form one.

A passage from *Narasimhapurāṇa* (one of the *upa-purāṇās*, often cited in the *Kalpataru*), is reproduced on p. 269, giving a list of twenty-one paradises (*svarga*) to each of which the donor of a particular gift is automatically lifted after his death. This is followed by the long citation from the *S'āntiparva* (ch. 240, sl. 12-38) of the *Mahābhārata* commemorating the glorious after-death destiny of some illustrious donors of the past.

Provision of Water

In a tropical country in which animal and vegetable life is dependant on seasonal rains and the storage of water for drink and irrigation in suitable reservoirs, or the tapping of subterranean springs by deep wells, special merit will naturally attach to the provision of such facilities for water. To a statesman the subject will appeal even more than to a mere ritualist. The supply of water naturally leads to the subject of tree-planting, both for shade and for other uses, as trees depend on water even more than animals. The two topics are usually not held to come under the strict view of *Dāna*, as already explained, as the dedication of trees and tanks is not to be classed under a gift to a specific donee. The beneficiaries in these dedications are indeterminate. The benediction at the end calls for the satisfaction (by the act of dedication) of the gods, ancestors and men (*deva pitṛmanuṣyāḥ priyantām iti utsṛjet*, p. 288). Nīlakanṭha deals with these topics in a separate section of his digest (*Utsarga-mayūkha.*) It is a very small section, hardly deserving to be placed side by side with the other *mayūkhas*, but purism required a separate treatment of *utsarga* apart from *dāna*, to which a *mayūkha* is devoted. Lakṣmīdhara was an expert in Mīmāmsa and must have been aware of the solecism of bringing such works of public utility under *dāna*. His action in defying convention, in view of the practical importance of such works, and of giving additional attractions to them by classifying them under gifts of spiritual efficacy has given a lead to subsequent writers, who, with the exception of Nīlakanṭha, have followed his example and dealt with such dedications as gifts, finding, like Govindānanda, warrant for it under the rule that an absent or invisible donee might be given a gift (even without his knowledge)

by simply pouring water on the ground, after mentally resolving that the gift should go to him (p. 124)[1]

The sources of water supply are treated, as stated in a definition cited from the *Kapila-pañcarātra* in the *Dāna-kriyākaumudi* (p. 126) as five: the *kūpa* or well, which may have a diameter upto fifty spans of the hand; the *vāpikā*, with a diameter upto 100 spans; *puṣkariṇī*, which exceeds a hundred spans, and goes upto 200; *taḍāga*, whose width extends 800 spans; and the *naḍī* (river) which exceeds this too.[2] The spiritual advantage accruing to a giver is in proportion to the size of the reservoirs.[3] To understand the descriptions, one must have knowledge of parts of India in which water is struck in wells at great depths, and the cost of even a small well is considerable. To excavate a well and line it with stone or brick, build steps to get at the water, and plant around the well groves of shade-giving or fruit-trees, and then find that the well goes dry, is not an unusual experience in North India. Such drying up is deemed providential, and as due to failure to make the dedication with proper ceremonies, and to begin the excavation at suitable astrological moments. The wells spoken of are, not those reserved for private use (though to them also the astrological and ceremonial rites will apply) but wells thrown open to the public, after making the dedication in the presence of the sacred fire (which is a witness, *agni-sākṣī*) and worshipping the Ocean (*Samudra*) as the divine parent of all water (p. 278). The goddess Ambikā and the god Gaṇes'a (Vināyaka) are to be worshipped in effigy, at the commencement of the ceremony of dedication, and the idols are to be left immersed in water. The ritual includes the worship of the Fire and Varuṇa, with a number of Vedic mantras (which are specified on pp. 283-284, and identified on pp. 355-357 in Appendix C). A full quota of priests is needed for the rites, who are to receive appropriate

[1] मनसा पात्रमुद्दिश्य भूमौ तोयं समुत्सृजेत् ।
विद्यते सागरस्यान्तो न तद्दानस्य विद्यते ॥

[2] पञ्चाशद्धि भवेत् कूपः शतहस्ता तु वापिका ।
पुष्करिण्यस्तदूर्ध्वन्तु यावद्धस्तशतद्वयम् ॥
तडागोऽष्टशतस्यान्तस्थो नदी च स्यात्तदूर्द्ध्वतः ॥

[3] एषां च संख्यातारतम्येन गाम्भीर्यतारतम्येन च फलस्यापि तारतम्यं बोद्धव्यम् ॥

dakṣiṇas. In the ritual given metal figures of aquatic animals like crocodiles (*makara*) and fish (*matsya*) are to be immersed in the sacrificial pot, the emblem of the future reservoir. Till the ceremonies are completed, the water is declared impure and unfit for use. (*Utsargamayūkha*, p. 23, ed. Gujarathi Press).[1] An additional rite is to pour into the well water from sacred rivers, then worship the Mothers of the waters (*Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, cited in *Utsargamayūkha*, p. 8)[2] and to imagine (with invocation) *twenty* named *tīrthas* in groups of five (*pañcatīrtāni*) as resident in the well. (*Danaratnapradīpa*, IV, p. 297).[3] The dedication should be to all living beings, who should be invited by the donor to revel in the water.[4]

ḌVĀRĪBANDHA

A special type of work, which Lakṣmīdhara holds up to veneration, is the damming of a mountain spring, so as to form, from the nature of its location, a high level reservoir, which might be used for irrigation. The value of such a reservoir will be evident to those who are familiar with the Gangetic plain, in which water from the great river is so far below the level of the adjoining arable area that lifting it is difficult. The Ganges Canal starts from the Himālayas near Hardwar. The bund may be a long

[1] वापी कूपतडागेषु संस्थितं प्रथमं जलम् ।
अपेयं तु भवेत्सर्वं तज्जलं सूतिकासमम् ॥

[2] एवं जलं जले क्षिप्त्वा पूजयेज्जलमातरः ।

[3] कुरुक्षेत्रं गया गङ्गा प्रभासः पुष्कराणि च ।
एतानि पंचतीर्थानि तडागे निवसन्तु मे ॥
वितस्ता कौशिकी सिन्धु सरयूश्च सरस्वती ।
एतानि पंचतीर्थानि तडागे निवसन्तु मे ॥
दशार्णमुरलासिन्धुरेवावर्ता दृषद्वती ।
एतानि पंचतीर्थानि तडागे निवसन्तु मे ॥
यमुना नर्मदा रेवा चन्द्रभागा च वैदिका ।
एतानि पंचतीर्थानि तडागे निवसन्तु मे ॥
गोमती वाङ्मती शोणा गण्डकी सागरैस्तथा ।
एतानि पंचतीर्थानि तडागे निवसन्तु मे ॥

[4] "सामान्यं सर्वभूतेभ्यो मया दत्तमिदं जलम् ।
रमन्तां सर्वभूतानि स्नानपानावगाहनैः ॥"

one. In that case, sluice-gates for the draining of excess water (*dvāraka*) have to be provided (p. 292). Flights of steps may be built, into it, and gardens and temples near the bund. The description seems to imply one of an actually existing irrigation dam. The merit of constructing such a reservoir is naturally greatest among the provision of supplies of water. " The merit (*puṇya*) which accrues from the Vedic sacrifices of the cow, man and the horse, are excelled by the merit accruing from the construction of such a dam " (p. 296).

Temples and Maṭhas

A brief allusion to the merit of dedicating temples and *maṭhas* is made in the context of providing a large reservoir (pp. 197-199). It is expressly enjoined that such structures are not to be constructed in waterless places, nor should such reservoirs be deemed complete without adjoining shrines, whose benedictory influence will protect them (p. 299). A temple of Vighnes'a is specially valuable for such protection (p. 299).

Dedication and Planting

A love of trees is natural in a tropical country subject to periods of heat and drought. Dedication of trees is of use as protecting them against wanton cutting down. Mangoes and pomegranates are recommended (p. 301) along with other fruit trees for planting. The verse of *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* stating that he who plants an *as'vattha*, a *picumanda*, a *nyagrodha*, ten tamarind trees (*tintriṇī*), three each of *kapittha*, *bilva*, and *āmalaka*, five mangoes and five cocoanut trees, never goes to hell is cited in other digests.[1] To treat an *as'vattha* as a son, perform its *upanayana* and marry it in due course to a smaller tree, which will twine itself with the *as'vattha*, was recommended for childless men.[2] Lakṣmīdhara does not pitch the service very high:

[1] अश्वत्थमेकं पिचुमन्दमेकं न्यग्रोधमेकं दशतिन्त्रिणीकम् ।
कपित्थबिल्वामलकत्रयं च पञ्चाम्रनाली नरकं न याति ॥
Cited with variants by Hemādri, p. 940.

[2] पद्मपुराणे—अपुत्रस्य च पुत्रत्वं पादपा इह कुर्वते ।
यच्छन्ति रोपकेभ्यस्ते सत्तीर्थे तर्पणादिकम् ॥

planting five trees assures one of the heaven of S'iva (p. 303)! He who donates a fruit tree to Dharma (charity) reaches the mansion of Varuṇa after death (p. 304). The merit of adopting the *as'vattha* tree is extended to other trees like the *pippala*, *plakṣa* etc. The adoption of a tree may be made, like that of a living son, with *datta-homa* rites in the presence of the Fire. (p. 308). The virtues of arboriculture are lauded with picturesque exaggeration in a couplet. "In merit, the provision of ten wells is equal to that of giving on *vāpī*, of ten vāpīs is the provision of one big tank (*hrada*), a son brings merit equal to that of to ten large tanks, but a tree confers the same spiritual advantage as ten sons."

ĀS'RAYA AND PRATIS'RAYA

Lakṣmīdhara's treatise on *Dāna* ends with a short eulogy of the construction of *ās'raya* (homes of rest) for ascetics (commonly spoken of as *ās'rama*) and of rest-houses for travellers (*pratis'raya*), both in the vicinity of towns and on the road-side. These are dedicated specially to the regenerate classes (*dvijātayaḥ*, p. 312). The choultry is to have as protection the idols of some of the gods. "Who is competent to sum up the spiritual fruit (*phala*) of a rest-house so dedicated? A bald estimate will put its benefit as four, *viz.*, comfort, kingship, fame and prosperity."

CONCLUSION

With the above words ending with the auspicious word "*s'riyaḥ*," Lakṣmīdhara brings to an end his review of *Dānadharma*. He did his self-appointed task in no spirit of mechanical reproduction of ancient dicta, but used his judgment as regards what should be stressed and what slurred over, within the limits of the conventions to which he had to conform. His individuality is evident in the selection for prominent commendation of the donations or dedications which aim at reducing human suffering, pain and ignorance. The treatment of *Vidyādāna* reflects the insight of the scholar and statesman. Indian social order was maintainable only by an equipoise of duties laid on

different social grades. Public honour and spiritual service went to a section, which was divorced from worldly ambitions and pursuits, leaving it to follow its high duty without the distractions of common desires, as well as of ordinary economic pursuits. Social esteem *can* reconcile a class to high service combined with life-long poverty, as it did in India almost to the threshold of our times. But, to make the members of the class maintain themselves, would be to endanger the single-minded discharge of their spiritual and educational duties. So, their endowment became a responsibility of the rest of society. Their maintenance had to be done in a way that would not run into conflict with their self-respect, or degrade them with the taint of mendicancy. Such men should not beg; they were not to ask in order to receive. That charity might prove a curse to him who receives was a truth that was visualised in the attitude to *Dāna*, which made acceptance of a gift a moral peril, that could be faced by a donee only from a high sense of helpfulness induced by a feeling of compassion for a donor to whom a gift was the *only* way of escape from present or prospective ill. The aim must be to induce in the affluent classes a sense of their obligations to the distressed and the poor, to generate a feeling of reciprocal dependence in all classes of society, to instil the feeling that moral and spiritual responsibility do not begin or end with life in this world, to strengthen conviction in the grave responsibility for the upkeep of social order and the order of the universe, which lies on those to whom are given wealth and worldly power. One way of developing and enforcing the conviction, is shown in the ancient doctrine of gifts. Its enunciation, elucidation and elaboration, so as to suit the changing needs of the age, was a duty of the lawgiver and the statesman. Lakṣmīdhara, on whom this high duty was devolved by his erudition, birth, and office, entered into its spirit, and essayed to display the means of grace to his patron and to future kings by the insight into Dharma, learning and literary skill which are reflected in the *Dāna-Kalpataru*.

NOTE B

DIGESTS ANTERIOR TO THE KṚTYA-KALPATARU

THE composition of a digest (*nibandha*) imposes more strain on the skill of a smṛti-exponent than the composition of an elaborate commentary (*vyākhyā* or *bhāṣya*) on a smṛti enjoying universal esteem. The commentator is saved the necessity for a logical presentation of his material, as he is bound to follow the arrangement of matter in his original. In a diffuse smṛti like that of Manu, in which the same topic is treated of in different chapters, this will lead to either repetition, or condensation in one place of what has been explained in another, and the commentator's views, in relation to the various authorities which he cites and explains, will be scattered over different sections. A digest can make its own scheme and then follow it. It is not restricted to any arrangement that is laid down in a smṛti, except in regard to such well-recognised divisions as the eighteen topics of *vyavāhāra*, and even in treating of the latter, it can follow its own order of presentation of the topics. *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* is not only more compact but is better arranged than other *smṛtis*, A running commentary on it will be ordinarily more logical in arrangement than a similar comment on a loosely strung *smṛti*, like that of Parāśara or Viṣṇu. This was probably why Vijñāneśvara chose to present his digest of *Dharmaśāstra* in the form of a commentary on that code. As already pointed out, Laksmīdhara excels the authors of other digests in following a logical scheme, consistent with the Indian view of life, grouping the treatment of the several aspects of *Dharmaśāstra* on fourteen major topics, which punctuate a man's life between conception and emancipation.

Lakṣmīdhara was not the inventor of the digest. There were not only *bhāṣyas*, like the famous commentaries on Manu

and Yājnavalkya by Medhātithi and Visvarūpa, but *nibandhas* in the field before the appearance of his work. He recognises their existence, not only by citing some of them, like the *Prakās'a* and the *Pārijāta*, along with an unnamed work of Halāyudha, and the *Kāmadhenu*,[1] in explaining a passage of Kātyāyana, but he alludes vaguely to the existence of other works by the expression *prabhṛtayaḥ*, appended to the enumeration of the authorities. He justifies the attempt to supply a new *nibandha* by stating that it excelled previous writings of the class. In verses 12 and 13, in the proem to the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*[2] he definitely names three works which his digest excelled. These are the *Mahārṇava*, the *Kāmadhenu* and the *Mālā*, for which the full name *Ratnamālā* is conjuctured on metrical grounds.

Of these, the *Mālā* is a work of which we possess no knowledge besides this allusion. The *Kāmadhenu* is a well-known work to which others besides Lakṣmīdhara have paid tribute. Following the example of Lakṣmīdhara, whom he deliberately imitates in his proem to his *Kṛtya-ratnākara*, Caṇḍes'vara places only three works at the head of the class which his *Ratnākara* is claimed to have excelled. These are in the order of enumeration, the *Kāmadhenu*, the *Kalpataru* and the *Pārijāta*.[3] He cites the *Mahārṇava*, as *Smṛti-Mahārṇava-kāraḥ* in the *Kṛtya-ratnākara*.[4] He also refers to *Bhoja-bhūpāla* either as Bhūpāla or Bhoja-Bhūpāla several times.[5] It has been noted already[6] that though Bhoja is definitely earlier than Lakṣmīdhara, the latter does not refer to him at all anywhere in his digest. Caṇḍes'vara cites Halāyudha,[7] who must be the same writer

[1] "यदा प्रसादे स्वामिना दासस्य कृते दत्तं तत्र दासधनेऽपि स्वामी प्रभुरिति प्रकाश-हलायुध-कामधेनु-पारिजातप्रभृतयः ।' (व्यवहारकल्पतरौ).

[2] See Note A, *infra*, pp. 45-56.

[3] यस्मिन्न किञ्चिदपि शंसति कामधेनुः
यन्नेष्टमल्पमपि कल्पतरु र्नदत्ते ।
धत्ते न गन्धमपि कश्चन पारिजातः
तत्सर्वमेव विभिनक्ति नयप्रवीणः ॥
(*Kṛtyaratnakara*, *Bib. Ind.*, 1925, p. 6).

[4] *Ibid.*, पृ. ६१९.

[5] *Ibid.*, पृ. ५८, १७१, १७७, २०५, २७८, ३२३, ४९६, ६२५.

[6] *Infra*, p. 21, *note* 2.

[7] *Kṛtyaratnakara*, pp. 319, 327, 332.

referred to by Lakṣmīdhara. These are the pre-*Kalpataru* writers or works alluded to or cited by Caṇḍes'vara.

That Caṇḍes'vara's enumeration does not follow chronology is evident from his placing the *Kalpataru* between the *Kāmadhenu* and the *Pārijāta*, both of which are named in the *Kalpataru*. If Gopāla is the author of the *Kāmadhenu*, as is argued on grounds which appear conclusive, by Mr. Kane,[1] he was not far removed from Lakṣmīdhara in point of time, as in verse 11 of his proem, the latter describes Gopāla as his friend (*tad-vayasyaḥ*). We may take the *Kāmadhenu* as composed earlier than the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru* but in the same generation. We have the additional information in the above s'loka (*i.e.*, 11) that Gopāla composed his work in the form of *vākyas* :

गोपालस्तद्वयस्यः स्वकृतिविरचनं वाक्यरूपेण चक्रे ।

If it means merely that the work of Gopāla was in prose (*vākya*) it is not easy to see how it differs from the other *nibandhas*, unless we construe the description as implying that the work was a prose summary of *Dharmas'āstra*, a *Dharmasangraha*, which did not follow the earlier practice of being couched in verse. We have an example of this type of composition in the *Smṛtyarthasāra* of S'rīdhara (c. 1150-1200 A.D.)[2], which is mostly in prose, and treats of most topics of *Dharmas'āstra*, with the prominent exception of *vyavahāra*.

It is noteworthy that while Lakṣmīdhara in his claim for supremacy for his Digest mentions only three as those which it superseded, *viz.*, the *Kāmadhenu*, the *Mahārṇava* and the *Mālā*, the presumption is justifiable that he regarded these alone as serious rivals of his own work. But, why does he not cite them anywhere in his book ? That he did cite atleast one of them is likely, and it is the *Mahārṇava*. The reasons for this deduction are these. *Mahārṇava* is apparently referred to when he cites the *Smṛti-Mahārṇava* by Caṇḍes'vara. Hemādri refers to *Mahārṇava*, *Smṛti-mahārṇava* like (Caṇḍes'vara) and *Mahārṇava-Prakās'a*.[3] It is extremely likely that all these names refer to one

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 295-296.

[2] Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 237. It was printed in the Ānandās'rama Series.

[3] " महार्णवप्रकाशकारो मन्यते " चतुर्वर्ग. III, I, 1031.

and the same work, as suggested by Mr. Kane,[1] and that the *Prakāśa* and *Mahārṇava* are identical.

The proem of Lakṣmīdhara alludes to a digest, which he calls the *Mālā,* of which we have been unable to obtain a trace. That it must have been of sufficient reputation to justify its being mentioned side by side with the *Kāmadhenu* and the *Mahārṇava* is to be inferred from Lakṣmīdhara's mention of it in such a context. But that so prominent a work should not have been mentioned at all by Caṇḍeśvara and later writers will appear strange, unless the name *Mālā* conceals an allusion to some work of established reputation like the *Parijāta*.

[1] Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

NOTE C

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE DĀNAKĀṆḌA OF THE KṚTYA-KALPATARU

So far as known only seven manuscripts or fragments of manuscripts of this section of the *Kṛtya-kalpataru* are now available. They have all been used, in preparing the present edition. The press copy was based on a transcript carefully made under orders of the Government of His Highness the Mahārāṇa of Udaipur (Mewār) of an undated manuscript in the Palace Library at Udaipur. The original manuscript is on paper, and consists of 93 folia, each page containing on the average ten lines and forty letters to a line.[1] Its appearance is old, and it is apparently a transcript of a much older manuscript. Its agreement with the text adopted by Hemādri in many cases suggests that it is from an original that he used, or that both were descended from a common manuscript.

The oldest dated manuscript of this section of the great Digest is one in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. It bears the stock number 4026, and is on palm-leaf, closely written in old Maithila characters. In appearance it is discoloured and is in parts worm-eaten. There are 131 leaves in all, with five lines to a page. The post colophon[2] gives two

[1] Peterson's "*Report on the search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Circle*, 1882-1883, 1883," p. 109.

[2] लसं ३७४ कात्तिक सुदि ५ छवि अजिनौलीग्रामे समस्तक्रियाविराजमाने महावर कुमार श्रीमद्गदाधरसिंहदेवपादानामाज्ञया श्री शुभपतिना लिखितमिदं पुस्तकमिति शके १४२६ ॥

नमो भवानीवदनारविन्दविलोकनव्यग्रविलोचनाय ।
अपारसंसारसमुद्रपारसन्तारसेतो भवतो (वे) भवाय ॥
कमलनयन वासुदेव विष्णो धरणिधराच्युत शंखचक्रपाणे ।
भवशरणमितीरयन्ति ये वै त्यज भट दूरतरेण न पापान् ॥
धन्यन्तदेव लग्नं तन्नक्षत्रं तदेव धन्यमहः ।
करणस्य च सा शुद्धिः यत्र हरिः प्राङ् नमस्क्रियते ॥
गतलक्ष(क्ष्म)णदेवीय चतस्सप्तत्यधिकशतत्रयाब्दीय कार्त्तिकशुक्लपंचम्यां रौहिणेये ॥

dates, one in S'āka and the other in the Lakṣmaṇasenīya era. They are (L. S.) 374 (A.D. 1493) and (S'āka) 1426 (A.D. 1504). The two dates do not agree, as there is a discrepancy of eleven years between the two.

As the L. S. date is given in words also, it has to be taken as the actual date of the transcription of this manuscript. Rai Bahadur Monmohan Chakravarti (*J. A. S. B.*, N. S., XI, p. 358 footnote) pointed out that the scribe S'ubhapati, who made this transcript in L. S. 374 by order of Gadādharadeva made a copy of another manuscript in L. S. 373 (Rajendralāla Mitra, *Catalogue of Manuscripts from Nepal*, p. 65). Gadādhara-deva was the grandson of Dhīrasimha, brother of the Maithila king Bhairavendra. The *Gaṅgākṛtyaviveka* was composed in L. S. 376, when Rāmabhadra, son of Bhairavasimha or Bhairavendra was ruling. (*J. R. A. S.*, N. S., xx, 554).

The next in order of date of the seven manuscripts is one in the Colebrooke collection in the India Office Library. (No. 1461). It is on paper, and contains 101 leaves, closely written in Bengali characters, with ten or eleven lines to a page. The first four folia are by a different hand from the rest of the manuscript. It was copied by the S'ūdra Kavicandra in S'āka 1510 (*i.e.* 1588), and euologises the Bhaṭṭacārya family.[1] The literary activity of the great Smārta Bhaṭṭacārya, Raghunandana, is dated between 1520 and 1570 A.D. by Mr. Kane,[2] while Monmohan Chakaravarti (*J. A. S. B.*, N. S., xi, pp. 351-357) places him between 1510 and 1565 A.D. It is possible that this copy was made for one of his descendants, or even for him.

The next manuscript of *Dāna-Kalpataru* in point of age is one in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, bearing the number 10236. It is on paper, the leaves are marked 17-24 and 1-8, with ten to eleven lines to a page. It is a fragment and deals only with *pātrāpātra-nirūpaṇam*. It bears the date Samvat 1658 (1601 A.D.).

I discovered in January 1939 in the Junior Bhonsle Mahāraja's Library at Nagpur a legibly written paper manuscript in Nāgari script. It had lost the first two leaves, dealing with pp. 1-4 *infra*. On last leaf it states that it was copied by

[1] See p. 313 *infra*.
[2] *History of Dharmaśāstra*, I, p. 419.

Govinda in Samvat 1735 (*i.e.* 1688 A.D.). As this manuscript came to light after the book had been printed, its readings are now presented in Appendix G (pp. 383-412, *infra*).

Paṇḍit R. Anantakṛṣṇa S'āstrī secured from Benares for the University Library at Lahore a manuscript of this kāṇḍa, and drew my attention to the manuscript early in 1938.[1] It bears the stock No. 8162. Its readings are collected in Appendix A (pp. 315-330, *infra*). On the fly leaf it bears the Samvat 1778 (*i.e.* 1722 A.D.)

The Sarasvatībhavan at Benares has five loose folia dealing with a *dānaprayoga* from the *Kṛtya-Kalpataru*. It presented no special readings.

[1] His letter to me is dated 15-1-1938. He had also secured a manuscript of the *Tīrthakāṇḍa* for the Library of the Punjab University.

NOTE D

LIST OF WORKS ON DANA

* An asterisk denotes that the work has been printed.
Denotes that a transcript now exists in the Adyar Library.

A. Parts of Nibandhas dealing with Dāna

* *Dāna-Kalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara (c. 1110 A.D.).
* *Dānasāgara* of Ballālasena (c. 1168 A.D.) ; partially printed.
* *Dānakhaṇḍa* of Hemādri (c. 1270 A.D.) ; part of *Caturvarga-cintāmani* (pr. *Bibliotheca Indica*, and Prabhākarī and Co., Benares).

† *Dānaratnākara* of Caṇḍes'vara (c. 1300 A.D.).

† *Dānaratna* or *Dānavivekoddyota* of Madanasimha, (c. 1425 A.D.) part of *Madanaratnapradīpa*.

Dānasāra of Dalapati (part of *Nṛsimhaprasāda*) c. 1500 A.D.

* *Dānakriyākaumudī* of Govindānanda (c. 1500 A.D.), part of his *Kaumudī* series (*Bibliotheca Indica*, 1903).

Dānatàtva of Ragunandana (Jayaswal's *Catal*, 200) c. 1550 A.D.

Dānasaukhya of Ṭoḍarmal (c. 1580 A.D), part of *Saukhya* series

Dānakautuka of Nandapandita (c. 1600 A.D.) part of *Harivams'a-vilāsa*.

Dana-Kamalākara of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (c. 1625 A.D).

Dānamayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha (c. 1625 A.D.) part of the *Bhagavanta-Bhāskara*.

Dānaprakās'a of Mitra Mis'ra (c. 1625 A.D.), part of the *Vīra-mitrodaya*.

Dānakaustubha of Anantadeva (c. 1650 A.D.), part of *Smṛti-kaustubha*.

Dāna-hīrāvalīprakās'a of Divākara, son of Bhāradvāja Mahādeva (c. 1685 A.D.), part of *Dharmas'āstra-sudhānidhi*.

Danaratnakara of Bhattarama (c. 1675 A.D.) part of *Anupa-viveka.*

Danaratna of Manirama Dīksita (c. 1160 A.D.) part of *Anupa-vilasa* or *Dharmambodhi.*

Dana-bhagavata of Varni-Kuberananda, protege of Rana Samgrama Singh (c. 1500 A.D.).

Dana-parijata of Ananta Bhatta son of Nages'a Bhatta (c. 1625 A.D.) part of *Pārijāta* series.

B. Treatises on Dana

Danakanda (said to be extracted from *Rudra-Yamala*)

Danacandrika of S'rinatha Acaryacudamani (c. 1500 A.D.) Calcutta Sanskrit College, II, 556, 563).

Danacandrika of Gautama (B., 3. 92).

Danacandrika of Jayarama (L : 2102) "Abstract of Hemadri" (Kane).

* *Danacandrika* of Divakara (Kale) ; pr. Bombay.

Danacandrika of Nīlakantha (Hiralal, 2176-2178).

Danacandrika of Vrindavana (N.W., 136 ; N.P. iii, 26-).

Danacandrikavali of S'rīdharapati (Kielhorn, 74).

Danadarpana cited by Raghunandana (Oxf., 292).

Danadinakara of Kamalakara (L., 180 ; B., 3, 90).

Danadinakara of Divakara son of Dinakara (K. 180).

Danadidhiti of Nilakantha son of Bhaskara (Aufrecht, III, 54).

Danadipavali (Haraprasad, Rep. Search., 1895-1900, p. 15).

Dānadipavakyasamuccaya (Peterson, I, 116).

Dānadharma-vyakhya by Arjunamis'ra (Varendra Res. Socy, Rajshahi).

Danadharmaprakriya of Bhavadeva Bhatta, son of Krsnadeva of Mithila (L. 1834) prior to 1600 A.D. (Mitra, *Notices of MSS.* V, 144 ; Jayaswal, 188-189).

Danapanjika of S'uryas'arman, composed under orders of Navaraj Simha (Peterson, V., 177 ; Jayswal, 187, 195).

Danapanji of Ratnakara Thakkura (summary of *Danasāgara*), L., 2002 ; Petrson, I, 116, III, 387).

Danapaddhati of Ramadatta, cousin of Candes'vara, and minister of the Karnata king Nrsimha of Mithila, c. 1350 A.D. ; (Mack. 33 ; I. O. Cat. iii, 1714).

Danapaddhati by Gaga Bhatta (Vis'ves'vara Bhatta), c. 1650 A.D. (Hıralal, 2183 ; Bikanir, 2422).

Danapariksa of S'rīdhara Mis'ra (Kāsmīr, 24).

Danaparijata of Ksemendra (L. 2822).

Danapradīpa by Madhava son of Visnu (Hīralal, 2184 ; Nep. Cat. Haraprasad, 1238).

Danaprayoga by Bhattoji (L. 4161).

Danamanjari by Vrajaraja (N.W. 164).

Danamanohara by Sadas'iva (c. 1679 A.D.) ; B, 3, 92 ; Bikanir New List, 1971.

† *Danavakyasamuccaya* of Yogıs'vara (anterior to 1300 A.D.) (B, 3, 92 ; Kh., 73 ; Adyar, I, p. 111).

Danavakyavali of Vidyapati Thakkura, composed at the instance of Queen Dhiramati wise of Nrsimhadeva of Mithila (c. 1400 A.D.) L., 1830 ; Bikanir, N.L., 2003 ; Jayaswal, 192, 194 ; Hiralal, 2193. It is sometimes attributed to Queen Dhiramati herself.

Danavakyavali by Vıres'varasunuh (*i.e.*) Candes'vara, c. 1300 A.D. ; Oudh, 516.

Danaviveka cited by Hemadri and by Nīlakantha ; Khatma, 3.

Danavyasa cited by Candes'vara in *Danaratnakara* (I.O. Cat. Eggeling, p. 412).

Danaviveka by Bhanuji Dıksita son of Bhattoji Dīkṣita (c. 1650 A.D.) ; Peterson, VI, 83 ; Hıralal, 2194-5.

Danasagara by Kamadeva Maharaja (of Mithila ?) L., 2179.

Danasara or *Aghabadava* of Vis'ves'vara Bhatta (Baroda Oriental Institute, 7129), the author of *Madanaparijata* (c. 1380 A.D.)

Danarnava composed for Queen Dhiramati (c. 1400 A.D.) ; Madras Orl. MSS. Lib., 3209.

Danoddyota by Krsnarama (N.W., 106, 174).

Mahadanapaddhati of Rupanarayaṇa (I.O. Cat., p. 550) cited by Vacaspati Mis'ra (c. 1450 A.D.).

Mahadananirnaya of Bhairavendra of Mithila (supposed to have been composed by Vacaspati Mis'ra ; Haraprasad, Cat., 36, 122. Ulwar, Catl. 1413).

Tuladanavidhi of Nārāyana Bhatta, son of Rāmes'vara (c. 1550 A.D.).

Printed by C. Subbarayudu at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras, India.